AUGUSTINE AND ROMANITAS

A dissertation by

Dorothy H. Donnelly, CSJ, Ph.D.

presented to

The Faculty of the

Graduate Theological Union

in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Theology

Berkeley, California
October 13, 1972

Committee Signatures:

Massey H. Shepherd, Jr.
Chairman

Terrence O'Donnor, SJ

Edward D. Willis

Rev. Kevin Wall, OP

Pierre Etchelecu, OFM

XUM

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface ..... Augustine and Romanitas

Chapter I (Culture) ..... Romanitas -- the nature and characteristics of the ideology: philosophical, religious, and politico-economic; the sources 1

Chapter II (Education) ..... Paideia tou Kuriou -- the educational ideals and system of Graeco-Roman education; its relationship to Romanitas, to the Church Fathers, and to a budding Christian theology 61

Chapter III (Environment) ..... Africitas -- the geographical, political, cultural, social background of North Africa: locale of Augustine's ministry and doing of theology: Donatist, Catholic, and pagan milieux; the sources 111

Chapter IV (Experience) ..... Peregrinatio Africana -- the pastoral experience of Augustine as bishop, pastor, judge, polemicist in the Donatist Controversy; his psychological principle uniting his views of man, society, and history 148

Chapter V (Expectations) ..... In conspectu aeternitatis -- the manner in which Augustine's expectations and pastoral experience shaped his theological concept of ecclesia and his attitudes toward the Empire, the Emperor, the use of imperial coercion, and Romanitas 198

Epilogue 249

PREFACE

It has oft been stated that ideas, like men, have their kairotic moment, their particular period in history wherein the cultural milieu and the politico-social environment call for such a concept. When the man and the concept come together in intense fusion in that kairotic moment history is doubly blessed. I hope to find this the case in viewing Augustine's attitude toward the mystique of Romanitas, the ideal of classical civilization, embodied in the late Roman Empire and personified in the figurehead of that Empire, the Roman Emperor.

Beginning with his actions taken in the Donatist controversy, I will note the various views which seemed to govern Augustine's behavior in regard to the classical mystique of his time, Romanitas. It will be necessary to note these views in connection with the role of Romanitas in the plan of salvation, in human history, including his reaction to the Sack of Rome and her decline as imperial power, his view of the "divine" character of the Empire and its stance toward heresy and schism.

The pursuit of these goals will be based upon an understanding of what we mean herein by Romanitas. It will also imply delving into Augustine's background: the factors in his culture, education, experience, and environment which conditioned his responses to the Roman mystique and his attitude toward its philosophy and way of life.

XUM

My purpose in this pursuit is not to discover some theoretical definition of the State on the part of Augustine -- a definition too often wished upon him by later thinkers. Such a definition is hardly in keeping with the mentality of the ancient world. Rather, I would like to throw light on the interplay of external events and internal motivations which helped shape his attitudes in the period of the Donatist controversy, in particular, for I find him therein bombarded by both external and internal factors in African political history and cultural development. For this reason I confine my study to this period of Augustine's priesthood and episcopate when he played a key role in the development of this very milieu as it, in turn, shaped him.

I hope to find Max Weber's basic insight coming into play in noting Augustine's attitudinal development during this period. Weber felt that in order to understand historical change (I add: or psychological, theological, or ecclesiastical change) one has to consider both the external environment and the internal motivations of the people who respond to and help shape that external environment. The dynamics of attitudinal change are hardly exclusively materialistic or idealistic as seen in Augustine's life, of course. He grows, changes, and develops his theological concepts as he is changed by the activity and passivity of his personal experiences.

To accomplish this task I will make some use of the approach and method characteristic of the intellectual historian:

XUM

to find the relations between the ideas of the philosopher, the intellectual, and the actual way of living of those millions who carry the task of civilization -- with the happy difference that my scope confines me to one philosopher-theologian, Augustine, and the way of living and looking which proceeded from his conceptualizations and attitudes.

This task will also involve somewhat that of the social historian who wants to know what men and women believed true or false, right or wrong, beautiful or ugly, what they wanted from life, and how they saw their destiny when it was over. Naturally, this attempt throws me into the area of the philosophy of history as well, but with the reservation that my scope will demand tracing how Augustine's attitudes toward Romanitas were produced and his actions conditioned by these views.

On a canvas so large, it is somewhat comforting to note that this task involves the mystery of motivation and so leaves some areas inconclusively resolved. Modern psychology, sociology and philosophy agree that what goes on in a man's mind and heart that moves him to action or its opposite is still a mystery, part of the total mystery of human personality. Therefore, I will explore this fascinating terrain, making no claims to solve the mystery of Augustine's motivations conclusively, but still happy to base my study upon the works of a man who saw his life and times theologically and, above all, morally -- a helpful specification of scope for the historical

XUM

theologian.

In some sense, however, this limitation of scope is none such, for Augustine's conversion-experience so radicalized his entire world of thought and action that none of his writing or doing is exempt from examination when one seeks to determine his attitudinal stance. Yet an examination of the period and the controversy I have chosen gives necessary limitation in my goal of showing his philosophy-theology as coming to rest in the adoption of a principle which is for him the central theme as well as the explanation of both human nature and human society, and, therefore, of his view of the Romanitas which had evolved from the Greeks ideas of paideia and philanthropia.

Along with this principle will go a central concept of his theology, developed, I feel, from the strong African strain in his background and heritage, a concept which will help produce his change of attitude (so-called) toward the use of imperial force in the suppression of heresy and schism, a concept highly operative in his attitude toward Romanitas.

Lastly, I hope that my juxtaposing Augustine's cultural milieu with his intellectual, geographical-environmental backgrounds, and, above all, with his experience as priest-bishop, will throw some light on the question of his motivation insofar as that can be judged. As it does for every man, the central factor of that motivation will appear from the experience of his daily life in the tumultuous world of North Africa in the Later Empire.

CHAPTER I

The Romanitas of the Later Empire

When we ask what was Augustine's attitude toward Romanitas, we are in the area of questioning a component of his Weltanschauung, of his total attitude toward the world and man in history. Out of the many questions man has tried to answer about his world, we note that four have always emerged as primary in his search for meaning: the nature of the True, the Beautiful, the Good, and the Eternal. In other words, man gradually produced systems of answers to speak to those questions: Science, Aesthetics, Ethics, and Religion. And each system in some way enshrined values for the men of each age.

In the process of man's history, progress in any one of the areas mentioned above usually occurred when the meaning of one of the questions changed; not its form, but its content. As we shall see, Christianity produced a revolutionary change in society by a change in both questions and answers, particularly in the realm of ethics and religion. Augustine's thought was profoundly influenced by that Christian revolution in thought, a revolution which he himself inherited and re-shaped for the West. In his own pursuit of the True and the Good he made free use of philosophy which was for him aid and propaedeutic for Christian doctrine, e.g. the De Trinitate wherein he mines Aristotle's Categories for the concepts of substance and relation. Obviously, the now-entrenched compartmentalizing of

philosophy and theology which we experience today would have puzzled him. Philosophy, as he saw it, could never be a purely theoretical pursuit, for morality was central to Augustine's thought, as we shall see infra. Philosophy pursued wisdom so that man might be happy. Happy he could not be without morality and truth, and, in keeping with much of the contemporary thought of the period, Augustine stressed the practical dimension of both philosophy and theology. Ethics was an empty concept without religion, and that religion must be highly moral.

Therefore, an examination of his attitudes toward Romanitas is conditioned by Augustine's intellectual stance, his vision of all life as theological, of all history as moral history, with man's struggle for happiness its focal point. My scope, then, is not merely self-chosen, but dictated by the characteristic vision of my author.

When we proceed to describe the Romanitas to which Augustine would have reacted from 390 to 420 A.D., it is to the philosophical, theological, and religious aspects of that mystique that we are immediately drawn. This is not to preclude attention to any aspect of that mystique which would help us define and describe it, but merely to give sufficient emphasis to the aspects which loomed large in the mind of the African bishop.

Romanitas was simply one cultural answer on the part of a particular people to the perennial questions cited above. It was also an aura and a bouquet, at once the product and the conditioner of the Graeco-Roman social and political life style.

XUM

It was a mystique and a philosophy of life; for some, a religion of its own, sharing in its history and evolution the characteristics of the Roman political, economic, social story it informed, and in which was enshrined the Roman imperial value-system.

We are looking at Augustine in social context to ascertain his attitudes as source of his theology and behavior, and in so doing, we are also studying what he valued and cherished. All the more reason to avoid simplistic explanations for either attitudes or behavior. A combination of material and spiritual causes lies behind his viewpoints, of course, and a complex series of interdependent factors produces it.

All social phenomena are explained by a whole spectrum of causes and chief among these I cite material environment, social organization and spiritual culture. This means taking account of the geographic, economic, intellectual and religious conditions of a social culture. A culture, as we use it here, is the life pattern held in common, the sum of all the learned and shared elements in a society, and a system of meanings adequately symbolized. Dawson sees culture manifesting itself in a four-fold component: 1) work, the economic; 2) thought, the psychological, intellectual, religious; 3) place, the environmental-geographic; and 4) blood, the genetic factor.[1] Some attention will, then, have to be given to these factors in studying Augustine's value system and attitudes, but given his characteristic stance, the category of <u>thought</u> is the main

cultural aspect which claims our attention.

In the realm of thought, the cultural history of the Roman Empire cannot fail to take account of a master-fact of that story: the phenomenon of Christianity as source of cultural change. This phenomenon, as we have noted above, was part of the changes taking place in the radical questions men had asked from the dawn of history. And the change was deeper, more traumatic, more far-reaching in that it took place in the realm of a major change in thought, in man's value-system, and so, in his psychological, intellectual, and religious values and attitudes. Human history is endlessly fascinating because it seeks to record the story of man's will; it seeks to express the capabilities of the individual. One of the most important phases of such psychological development for man took place in the third and fourth centuries after Christ, a great shift in the realm of thought of which Augustine was heir and continuator.

Cooperation with nature and the pursuit of its laws had characterized ancient primitive cultures and gave birth to true civilization, for these implied reasonable purpose and a reflective vision of reality. This vision of reality itself was changed by the new view which began to infiltrate society in the fifth and sixth centuries B.C., the age of the Hebrew Prophets, and the Greek philosophers, and of Buddha and Confucius, the age which produced eventually the Hellenistic culture which changed Roman imperial civilization and helped produce its mystique of Romanitas. Into this Hellenistic-Roman milieu

XUM

had come Christianity. Its world view and concept of reality, the vital components of its religious philosophy and theology, directly affected the current cultural mystique of its time embodied in classical civilization and seen in its Roman dress in Romanitas.

What of the man who helps bring about this new view? Dawson calls him the prophet or the religious reformer, the greatest agent of social change, even though these men are themselves products of religious and social traditions. Plato was one of these in 400 B.C.; 400 A.D. saw another, Augustine. Both produced changes in what men prized: their value-systems, incorporating how they saw man, society, their earthly sojourn and their eternal destiny.

What of the Romanitas of the Later Empire, that which Augustine would meet head-on? In many ways it was a religion, a religion of culture in pursuit of a cultural religion.[2] It was vastly different from that of the Republic, different, even, from that of the Antonines. But it still showed some general characteristics: it was flexible, eclectic, yet worshipful of the past. All of these elements appear in the major proponents of the mystique: Cicero, Horace, Livy, and above all, Vergil who "gave final utterance to the spirit of classical paganism, the religion of culture."[3]

Cochrane's study of Romanitas, brilliant though it is, does not seem to stress enough this eclectic, variegated aspect of the mystique. He does not give the emphasis it requires to the

XUM

influence of Greek philosophy on the intellectual growth of the Christian Church, nor to the vital input of the Alexandrian Fathers.[4] For this reason I wish to mention some Hellenic-Hellenistic components of the culture which had such impact on Augustine's intellectual formation. These ideas in the realm of philosophy and theology, though Romanized, were important in the shaping of the Romanitas which he experienced. They also formed the substrata for both the pagan and Christian worlds of the fourth and fifth centuries A.D.

Romanitas was surely an ideology of power, one which held that it was possible to attain the goal of permanent security, peace, and freedom through creative political action. The Roman saw this goal as attainable for him through submission to the virtus and fortuna of a political leader, albeit a demagogue. This belief the Christians had to reject, since Christ was their leader; Augustine inherited this attitude.

One must note, however, that the working out of this philosophy of "Pax et Securitas"[5] entailed the loss of political freedom for the Roman citizen. Nonetheless the movement of the imperial political story seemed to feed the mystique of power as somewhat successful in the persons of an Augustus, a Trajan, a Marcus Aurelius. A peasant people suddenly called to empire would see surrender to the strong man a viable solution after a hundred years of strife and civil disintegration.

Yet Romanitas always remained identified by its characteristic striving to absorb the new, the useful, in alien cultures,

XUM

to discard the forms which did not contribute to the people's drive to power. For this reason they adopted and learned other cultural patterns in the pursuit of imperial goals, often under the stimulus of desire to appropriate what they saw as the true, good and beautiful of the neighbor or the conquered (Vergil, Aeneid, VI).

One such Roman borrowing from the Greeks was that of philosophical idealism, another master-fact of the imperial story and mystique. Again, in search of answers to the great questions, this notion arrived at the Tiber and gradually blended its waters with the Roman flood. Once sharply deflected in the fifth and sixth centuries, B.C., it was a major revolution in culture mentioned above: discarding a civilization based on cooperation with nature in divinized form, and embracing in its place a new view of reality rising in India and inherited by the Greeks of Ionia and Italy. It sought to pierce the veil of appearances to find the cosmic principle behind them.[6]

Plato gave it shape in deathless lines: a concept of a world of the Forms where Being and Beauty reside, a world to be attained through flight from the material corruption of appearances (Phaedrus 247), to return whence we came, freed from the prison-house of the body. These same dualistic tones ring out in the pages of Plotinus and Origen, the Neoplatonist last cry of ancient philosophy which sounded in the ears of the young Augustine with compelling charm (Conf. 7.17) in the summer sunshine of Milan in 386 A.D.

XUM

However, idealism saw the individual as set in his human relationships in a paralysis, a type assigned him by nature, so how was he to be integrated into society? How did idealism find answers to the ethico-moral, religious questions in the framework of the fifth century B.C., the source-period for the Plotinian Neoplatonism which so affected Augustine?

Greek political theory saw the principle of integration of man's relationships in justice in the life of the social form, the polis. The ancient Greek political project had for its goal equality in political life and happiness through united effort and discipline (Arist. Pol. 1.2.1263a). The Romans felt the impact of this notion in their evolving political system as they drew upon Greek riches in the sphere of political, intellectual, and cultural life. No more than the Greeks, however, were they exempt from the perennial problem of the rights of the individual and those of the commonwealth, a problem which had vexed the Christian Church from its beginnings and the African Church, in particular.

Apparently, the Greeks solved the problem temporarily, at least, in the euphoria of the post-Persian Wars. Barker says:

> Although the Greek thought of himself as one who counted for what he was worth in his community...the fact remains that in the political thought of Greece the notion of the individual is not prominent, and the conception of rights seems hardly to have been attained. It is, perhaps, precisely because the individual felt himself an influence in the life of the whole that he did not try to assert rights against the whole. Secure in his social value, he need not trouble about his individual person.[7]

XUM

The Romans experienced such a euphoria during the Augustan principate, and the charism of the Antonines provided the protecting framework within which Roman jurists established classical jurisprudence as the science of human relationships, while schoolmen set up the imperial system of Graeco-Roman education for citizens. Still in the days of the Later Empire none but the rich landowner would dare claim the security in his rights Barker cites above for the Greek citizen of Athens.

The citizen would be happy, so philosophy taught him, if he was true to the type nature had set him, and the state helped insure that happiness by its pursuit of justice. But, not only justice. The state was conceived of as an ethical association for the attainment of virtue, and virtue would insure the happiness of the commonwealth (Plato, Rep. passim). The individual and the state were so much one in their moral purpose that the state expected and was able to exercise an amount of coercion which seems strange indeed to us today. Both Plato and Aristotle see the positive inculcation of goodness as the mission of the State. Obviously, they started from a concept of the good of the whole; we, the individual and his rights.

It is understandable, then, how the Athenian could see his political theory as including a desire for the interference of the State and as an attempt to clarify the method of such interference. How else see the state in a complex in which there was no official priesthood, no Church-State relationships to ponder? Greek political theory comprised a theory of the state, yes, but,

also, a theory of morals and of law.

Aristotle saw the oneness of political science and moral philosophy as a truism, and the constitution was for him a way of life. It was the Roman spirit which spoke of political science in terms of jurisprudence. For Aristotle, the state was bound to habituate its citizens actively in the ways of virtue and that from an ethical basis informed by moral philosophy. He believed that it might help a man to spontaneous morality if he were to become habituated to such an action by the state's preparing the soul for the seed, an opinion which will find an echo in Augustine's Donatist writings (Aristotle, Ethics, 1179B.24-26).

So it was that the Romanitas which Augustine experienced in his fourth century milieu had behind it a long tradition of philosophy, of ethics, and of religious answers to how man saw his world and his commonwealth. Imperial Romanitas had its inception in the ambition of Augustus to blend in a practical way the classical ideal of civic freedom of the Republic with the need for a strong leader whose virtus and fortuna would give peace to torn Mediterranean lands.

Augustus built upon the ruins of the plans of Julius Caesar. The very name resurrects the problem which destroyed the Athenian polis: how to attain the classical ideal of equality in the polis and happiness in communal, freely-committed work and discipline. It was no accident that Livy tells the story of the fictitious Menenius Agrippa's reconciling the alienated

XUM

plebs entrenched on the Mons sacer by the parable of the Belly and the Limbs (494B.C.). A long tradition stretching back into the founding of the Greek cities called for homonoia (concord) and deplored stasis (discord) as inimical to happiness in the commonwealth (Livy, II.32.8).

Surely Julius Caesar would have provided a livelier example of the deplored stasis, but it would never do to question the memory of the deified "father" of the reigning princeps whose prestige had been so much enhanced by his relationship to the dictator. Augustine will later be deterred by no such scruple and will use Julius Caesar to advantage as an example of individual lust for power in his Civitas Dei (III.30). Caesar was indeed sui generis, the hero, the strong man, the demi-god, the embodiment of that Hellenistic individualism whose degeneracy Cato so feared. That individualism despaired of creative political action and communal effort to solve its problems. Happiness came from an individual striving or even an individual apathy divorced from political forms. Thus did Caesar flourish, for the intellectual and spiritual milieu of his world permitted the emergence of such a fortuna as his.

Cato's work-ethos and return to agrarian foundations still could not provide the basis of rights and common interests which, for Cicero, constituted the proper res publica (De Rep. 1.25.39). His own plan for a concordia ordinum, building upon the Epicurean search for such a solution through nature and reason was doomed to failure. Cicero felt that the latter

XUM

search was ineffective because of its advocacy of selfishness and neglect of social virtues--virtues he felt to be basic to Romanitas. Yet neither Cicero's nor the Epicurean answer provided the necessary solution.

The Romanitas of the Republic, then, seen in its idealizing thinkers, was merely the source-material of Augustus's construction of a viable ideology for his principate. His assuming to his own person the divine prerogatives in a gradual, political process only made him the heart of an imperial system fed by dying philosophies and mystery religions -- none of which satisfied the need for a power to protect civilization which would not share the fate of all such ideologies up to Augustus's time.

It is important to remember that our view of the gradually evolving mystique of Romanitas from Augustan, and Antonine, into the Dynastic variety of Augustine's time must take note of facts that help explain the operation of the ideology itself. First of all, we find in Romanitas a coming-together of Hellenic, Oriental, and Roman elements blending in a composite which operated to help shape Roman values -- very much like the blends produced in Roman philosophy, religion, and art -- an eclectic assimilation of elements which seemed to support the Roman mystique of power and eternal destiny.

Secondly, Romanitas was influenced by Greek political theory, itself conditioned by Greek philosophy. This political theory saw the citizen as a social beast who seemed to grow and develop in pursuit of his values only in relationship with

XUM

other men. Spiritual forces lay behind his thrust for development culminating in the desire for knowledge, creativity, activity which had produced Greek literature, science, art, philosophy -- answers to the great questions. If this heritage was to be passed on, the social system, the matrix of politics and government, must be controlled; so must the environment and all those who would threaten the hard-won heritage. Aristotle saw in this phenomenon the birth of the polis. The cult of power was born with it--yet, note, those in power always averred: for the "good" of the powerless-to protect his values!

This vision of power, truly a cultus which undergirt the manifestations of Romanitas will be important in the formation of Augustine's attitude toward that mystique. That vision assumed an ideal of human excellence (arete) and the conviction that it could be attained with the human material to hand, yet, always, for the Greek, in the context of communal life in the polis. Excellence as human ideal had inspired Greek thinkers from the dawn of their civilization. After, in the Golden Age, Hellas, through the lips of Plato, Aristotle, Sophocles, told the world that in Athens man might begin to fulfill his aspirations, implement his search for values, for answers to the great question: the true, good, beautiful, and eternal--and that the highest of these aspirations was moral.

In Homer, the ideal of excellence had been linked with physical prowess, noble blood and wealth, but always with a moral tone emerging in concepts such as aidos (sense of shame),

moira (fated portion), and dike (follower of the way), particularly the way of nature. The man who was dikaios refused to break the finest conventions of his time; he was aware of his obligations to his fellowmen, and out of this concept came eventually an ethical approach, blossoming in Aristotle.[8] It is notable that our dikaios acknowledged that righteous action was social action and that relationship was the basis of morality, a concept pregnant for later development.

The development of the concept of excellence (arete) is a fascinating study (one which can only be glanced at here). Ultimately found in the Roman virtus, after many modifications it became a highly significant element in the later mystique attached to the persons of the Roman Emperors, a central value cherished by Romanitas.

Pindar's concept of arete emphasized birth and wealth, but he advances the concept by asking what we are to do with them. He asks for training as well as what Cicero will later call ingenium (natural talent) in his Pro Archaia. Gradually arete came to mean beauty, strength, and eventually intellectual prowess as well.[9]

Soon, however, arete on the road to become virtus meant the quality of a man's life and there emerged gradually the idea of four central or cardinal virtues, core elements of Greek ethical life. Arete, from the notion of wealth, breeding, strength, became strongly redolent of intellectual prowess and we find the Sophists claiming it as an item in their curriculum

-- a teachable subject -- to the dismay of Socrates and Plato who see it as non-teachable in its moral connotations, a value no Sophist could impart for lucre. Concern for value, for arete, led to an emphasis on the moral quality of life as basis for life in society, as answer to the question of the good.

Fifth-century Greece (B.C.) had seen the growth of the idea of four essential qualities or virtues, and we find them in the Republic, though foreshadowed in Pindar's 3rd Nemean (3.70). Some writers feel that Plato's use of dikaiosune which has no antecedents in Greek usage was akin to the Hindu Dharma, i.e., the right performance of all duty, and shows the influence of Hindu thought on Plato mediated through the Pythagoreans.

In any case, we find Socrates' theory that knowledge is virtue in the Protagoras wherein he tries to show the identity of justice and piety, self-control and wisdom, along with courage (Plato, Prot. 345D). Plato makes phronesis (wisdom) the crown of the virtues -- a view quite consonant with the presentation of these four virtues in the Phaedo (69C): "The true moral ideal, whether self-control or justice or courage is really a kind of purgation from all these emotions, and wisdom itself is a sort of purification."[10]

Aristotle, nonetheless, saw the virtues as separated into intellectual and moral categories. He views phronesis as dealing with calculation: sophia, with certainties, and insists that the intellectual virtues can exist without the moral, but not vice versa (Arist. Nich. Ethics, VI). For our study of Augustine's

attitudes, it is significant to note that it was not Aristotle's, but Socrates' concept that finally passed into Jewish thought where Wisdom, following Plato, is seen as the power to discern right from wrong, to make moral judgments (Job 28.1-28; Prov. 8.1-9; Wisdom 7.1-8). For the Hellenizing Jew, Wisdom became a theological and ethical concept.[11]

Andreia (courage) could not serve as central core for moral theory, although it was later revived as the Latin virtus and became synonymous with all virtue. Paul uses it (I Cor. 16.13) to express the courage to stand strong in the faith (andrizesthe).

Dikaiosune (justitia) or legality deals with respecting the rights of others; it lay close to the heart of the ancient moral system and its political component. In the Republic it is seen as the chief of the social virtues (passim), deriving from the ideal Form of Justice, an eternal existent. But, for the Greek of Plato's day, it was a social virtue sanctioned by society, existentially present or absent in his political life. Aristotle will see justice as obedience to law, for his ethics is comprised in politics and his scheme of virtues does not follow Plato's, but is a rejection of the cardinal model (N.E.I.1094B 11).

On the road to Romanitas, the virtues encountered Stoicism which accepted Plato's justice and virtue scheme, but analyzed it differently (Cic. De off. 1.4,13-14), because they saw the goal of life according to reason in four forms: a desire for human society, for truth, for prominence, and a love of propriety. Here we find Cicero's source in Panaetius as he sets forth the

XUM

four virtues as wisdom, justice, courage, sophrosune, a theme which he treats more thoroughly in the De officiis (Cf. De fin. II 14,46-7).

Stoic influence, through Panaetius and Posidonius, appeared in Augustus's choice of virtues for his principate and thereby cemented them into the cornerstone of Romanitas: Virtus, Justitia, Pietas, and Clementia, a choice which we will see later in relation to the concept of imperial cult and ideology.

So, when we arrive at the onset of Roman imperial cult and ideology under Augustus, we see behind that ideology of Romanitas a long history of one of its aspects: virtus. That virtus became, gradually, a strong generic term with many shades of narrower connotation. It reflected the history we have seen above in regard to a word like andreia, or of arete itself in the Greek social-ethical story. Soon, for the Romans, virtus came to represent both of these latter terms, yet, always, with a popular leaning to that of andreia (courage) for the commons.

It is obvious that the approach to an ethical system through the medium of the cardinal virtues was neither a neat package that satisfied cultural exigencies nor an analysis that could stand up to the inroads of Christian writers whose Pauline thinking pushed for acknowledgement of faith, hope, and love as the basis of life in society. Through the influence of Cicero the four virtues appeared in Christian works, though they are not in the New Testament as such. Origen is the first to make mention of them, and Ambrose, by way of Cicero and the Stoics,

XUM

Christianizes them (De off.1.27) as grist for his catechetics and preaching.

When we come to Augustine, the virtues are Christian expressions of his predominant principle of love (De mor. Eccl. 25):

> Love cheerfully enduring all things for the sake of God; self-control is love keeping itself entire and inviolate for God; justice is love serving God only and therefore controlling all else that is subject to man; wisdom is love discriminating between those things which assist and those things which retard its approach to God.

Augustine's focusing of the virtue system in love is part of his approach to what he finds inadequate in the classical answer to the pursuit of happiness and that of Romanitas in particular. It serves here to illustrate the Christian rejection of the cardinal model as alone adequate for an ethical basis for the society of the Later Empire.

So we see the factor of control for the Roman in his ethical system as virtus, but what of the uncontrollable element he noted daily in every man's fate about him? The other side of the ideology of creative politics classical civilization bestowed upon the Romans was that of fortuna, especially, the fortuna of the strong leader. Fortuna was the result of the activity of a fickle goddess, of Chance, of Luck, of Tuche. A leader like Julius Caesar, then, was seen to possess the ancient equivalent of virtus par excellence, but even if his virtus had incorporated all of Panaetius's cardinal qualities, his fortuna, the unpredictable, the uncontrollable factor in his destiny, finally destroyed him.

Cochrane has well pointed out that from the ancient classical belief in power as constituted of virtus and fortuna came the malaise[12] of the Romanitas which Augustine experienced so strongly in Roman Africa. From such an ambiguous and patently false basis of protection for civilization came the sicknesses of the Empire: sterility, apathy, frustration, despair, and fear. This last plague spawned the means men used to allay it: belief in luck, in fortune, in astrological determinism. They could only see nature in this system as ruled by chance or fate, and the Empire as held together beneath the protecting aegis of one strong man's virtus and fortuna, notably that of Augustus and his successors. Soon these men assumed the prerogatives of divinity their subjects so generously conferred (with some happy exceptions). But, by the time of Augustine, the principate of Augustus had become the Dominate of Domitian and the Autocracy of Diocletian and Constantine. These successive stages saw an ever-increasing Hellenization and Orientalization of the imperial role of the divinized sovereign upon whose virtus and fortuna the classical ideology of Romanitas depended for its survival.

The components of the process of Hellenization and Orientalization included, of course, that emphasis on fortune we have noted above. This emphasis characterized Roman religion, the emperor-cult, and many of the beliefs which helped shape, change, and produce the fourth-century religious world Augustine encountered in his pastoral labors. Fortuna, that uncontrollable factor in the destiny of ruler or common man was a thoroughly

Hellenistic concept. Polybius (29.21.1-9) and Posidonius used her name. The Romans called such a daimon their genius Fors Fortuna (Terence, Phorm, 841) was an Italian goddess, however, identified in classical times with Tuche, with an ancient shrine at Praeneste and one on the Quirinal (Livy 29.36.8), but her greatest prominence was in Hellenistic and Roman Times.[13]

Neither philosophy, ethical systems, nor ancient religion seemed able to speak to this element of chance in the destiny of man and of society. The ethical systems of Plato and Aristotle and their successors show an endorsement of responsibility imperfectly reconciled with the determinism of their theodicy. The Stoics, (Democritus, for one) found necessity in the endless motion of the atoms as natural law, but chance and free will appear still in his ethics, while Epicurus, influenced by moral considerations, tried to use the atomic theory to preserve man's freedom. Yet, one must agree with Ferguson that the philosophies of the Hellenistic age, for all their nobility, were essentially philosophies of escape from the very insolubility of the problem of fate, fortune, chance, luck, fashioned to answer the crying needs of men who sought for that escape in the cultivation of "autarcy" or self-sufficiency. The Stoics enunciated that principle in their determinism seen in acceptance, basing their self-sufficiency on discipline and toil.

Autarcy seemed to be Hellenistic man's reply to Fortune. For our purposes in studying Augustine's antecedents, it is interesting to see the influence of autarcy on Philo whose

thought was shaped by Cynic Stoicism. Philo eagerly absorbed the works of Plato, Aristotle, and above all, Posidonius, and mediated that thought between Hellenistic philosophy and both Christianity and Neoplatonism. Not only did the author of the De mortibus persecutorum and Plotinus borrow from him, but Augustine may well have found some source for his two cities in the dualism of Philo.

Yet autarcy, while giving some answer to the threat of Fortune, failed to provide a philosophy of life for Graeco-Roman man, nor could it satisfy the moral aspirations of an imperial age which, in its selfish individualism, outlawed pity as an enemy of autarcy (Seneca, De clem. 2.4). Apathy, another Stoic principle was hardly more helpful. Nor did the Neoplatonists have a higher concept of pity. They declared it weakness to be touched by such a feeling (Plot.Enn.1.4.8). A society without true compassion is no home for man in that society. Man sought for solace from fear, frustration, and despair in religious aspiration and in that form of fatalism we call astrology. He remained confused, uncertain, and fearful, however, for without answers (for the educated) from philosophy or science, and given the sterility of pagan religion, there seemed to be no answer to his striving for a viable basis for political, social, intellectual, and religious life in the res publica.

We must not apply to imperial man our exclusive categories in regard to religion and astrology, however. Although, as the

XUM

twentieth century advances, one must admit, these categories seem not quite so exclusive. A fourth-century Roman could pray to Fate or Fortuna for success in his enterprises while believing in a fatalistic deterministic fashion that the planets and constellations were forces which influenced every portion of his life. Cumont notes that "a fundamental antinomy manifested itself all through the development of astrology, which pretended to be an exact science, but always remained a sacerdotal theology."[14]

On the one hand were Romans who saw astrology as the dictate of an irresistible fate, and therefore not to be placated: it was useless to ask oracles to tell one's future; it was fixed. Prayers were, then an opiate (Suetonius, Tiber.69). Man, in general however, escaped from his stars through Gnosis, magic, and the mystery religions. Astrology never lost the tone of its Oriental religious origin in Chaldean forebears, although Ptolemy's system of astronomy tried to give a rational basis for this belief. What developed was a turning to those Oriental gods and goddesses which seemed to insure by the potency of their influence over the stars, release of man from the rule of fate. It was this same release which the Christian apologists offered passim by their insistence upon the freedom of man's will (Min. Felix. Oct.36.1). But, until the lethal attack of Augustine upon astrology, the belief held an ascendancy which our age could hardly comprehend until recently when astrological tables appear in our newspapers (C. Dei, V.1.;Conf. Iv. 3.4).

XUM

Although astrology purported to be a science, it was actually a faith, no matter how much it claimed observation and mathematics as its basis. And it was also a theology whose fundamental dogma was that of a universal solidarity based on "sympathy" binding man and the heavens. Rising out of the confluence of Greek and Oriental in the kingdoms of Alexander, it constantly grew in influence, reaching its peak in the Roman Empire, permeating all of society, including the schools of philosophy.[15]

It is this all-pervasive aspect of astrology and its theological dimensions which interest us here. So pervasive were its religious dimensions that eventually they faded into the culture and were no longer specifically recognized while continuing to attract men to their belief and practice. For instance, the belief in catasterism, or translation into the stars, as well as assimilation with the gods were known and practiced in the Orient long before they reached Rome. A close bond existed, also, between the Oriental religions and astrology seen in that of the Syrian Baals and Mithraism. More important for our purposes, astrology strongly affected Roman religion itself.

Religion is a core element in any culture as the history of Western culture singularly proves, and nowhere more clearly than in the period of the Roman Empire from Paul to Chalcedon wherein the divorce between spiritual religion and social life, between official pagan religion and social life was so evident.

XUM

As we shall see, a moral and spiritual bankruptcy had occurred in the pursuit by a whole government and its social classes of the goal of material pleasure: corporate selfishness. For two centuries, from Augustus to Severus Alexander, the ancient world under Roman rule enjoyed opportunities for civilized living probably never seen in any other age, but the religious element in the culture had disappeared from the great cosmopolis. True, many of the upper classes found meaning in philosophy, but the true religion of Roman society was the cult of pleasure and success. Augustine rails against it (CD 2.20) as does Jerome (Ep.7.5).

Paradoxically, the age seemed to be a religious one in the proliferation of religious forms like the mystery religions, but such was not the case. Rather, religious men sought outside the political-social life of their own society for the spirituality they could not find therein. And, too often, the pursuit ended in another form of individualism or selfishness. So deeply had ancient civilization alienated itself from the religious spirit that it lost the allegiance of the best minds of the age, and destroyed itself. Augustine was one of such seekers.

Nowhere is this cultural change more apparent than in the evolution of what was styled official pagan religion, the religious expression of the ideal of Romanitas as Augustine would encounter it in a Symmachus. This once semi-pure religious expression was subject to the eclectic borrowings we have noted above, and was soon infiltrated by foreign cultural elements.

XUM

Roman religion faithfully reflected the influences in the surrounding environment.[16]

Significantly, early forms of magic and of animism show the underlying attitude of fear. Roman ritual is apotropaic; the evil spirits must be placated, so man's life becomes one of compact, of legal contract with the spirits--more materialism. He must make gifts to them (Horace, Odes 3.23.20). This attitude led unerringly to a rigid formalism, meticulously seen in Horace's descriptions, which demanded the right syllable at the right moment to the right god -- a very important characteristic of the later formal official cult of the Roman state which Augustine will oppose in his De civitate Dei.

It is true that the urbanization of Roman religion, field and household cults translated into the urbs, widened somewhat Roman religious concepts, but the transition was conservative, unimaginative, and unacceptable for city-dwellers worshipping in agricultural modes, all of which led to a stereotyped, sterile religion, with officials performing rites and citizens as spectators. This development led to a series of attempts to pump new blood into the religious experience of the Romans: the importations from without, climaxed in the acceptance of sidereal religion and astrological science seen above.[17]

Nor could Augustus stem the tide of Oriental cults and mysteries, for the cultural forces which pressed in upon the Roman State were of that all-pervasive blend which we call Hellenistic, a tonality which conquered the Roman world. Its

XUM

religious elements, the Greek, which we have seen above and the Oriental, strongly tinged by sidereal influences and astrological suppositions fused in its major expression in the Seleucid Empire as Hellenic culture and Babylonian civilization came together in the post-Alexandrian world in search of an international religion which it found in star-worship, strengthened by the notion of "humanity." Such a religion needed cosmopolitan gods, and Zeno so proclaimed the sidereal variety.[18]

When Augustine, then, opposed the basic religious component of Romanitas, pagan religion, he found it as fourth-century product, much changed and influenced through its imperial evolution. Not only did sidereal religions mould it, but the mention of Zeno recalls another factor which strongly shaped pagan Roman religion as it combined with the sidereal forms and mysteries. Stoic pantheism represented Reason as governing all, residing in ethereal Fire, and so the stars would necessarily share divine qualities. Stoicism was the catalyst; its conciliatory formula justified popular worship and ritual observance, came to terms with formalistic cults, especially, in Greece, and so easily gave an allegorical interpretation to the gods and reconciled them with the cosmology and ethics of the Porch.

Astrology, of course, was a form of religion, but its religious concept of the world inseparably combined with Greek philosophy. In the Hellenistic milieu the leading Stoics were Syrians, among them the polymath, Posidonius of Apamea, Cicero's teacher, whose arguments in favor of astrology at the beginning

of the Tetrabiblos influenced its acceptance. Posidonius, Panaetius' pupil at Athens, serves as an excellent example both of the influence of astrology on philosophy and of the religious nature of Hellenistic philosophy in its attempt to answer the fear and frustration men experienced in a fatalistic environment like that of the Empire.[19]

Elasticity, adaptation, and moral emphasis are seen in the New Academy, e.g. in Carneades (d.129B.C.) who calls justice a convention as did Epicurus. Yet Panaetius from whom Cicero drew his four cardinal virtues, was the first to try to transplant deliberately Greek philosophy to Roman soil.[20] He recognized the Roman dislike for the abstract, and stressed the practical: duty, life according to nature and reason, so that his theories of ethics and politics stressed the practical side of Stoicism, uniting both in the concept of reason, present in varying ways in all men, binding them in community. Part of the circle of P. Scipio Aemilianus, Panaetius had ever in mind the life of the Roman aristocrat and emphasized the active virtues of magnanimity, benevolence, and liberality over against the passive: fortitude and justice preached by his school. Like Polybius, he will tell the Romans that theirs was an ideal constitution for the ideal state, combining monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy.

Posidonius would show the same favor for his aristocratic friends and presented the Roman Empire (Histories) as an image of the commonwealth of God in its universal character. He

promised good aristocrats admission and an afterlife (Cf. Cicero's Somnium Scipionis). His Histories, a practical application of his philosophy, defended Roman imperialism as good for less advanced peoples "for the sake of their own improvement"! Posidonius saw politics and ethics as one, thus political and moral activity was a religious duty which would enable man to enjoy a happy life after death.

In regard to religion, Stoicism brought to Rome the idea of a divine immanence, a concept destined to be the seed for educated religious belief for a long period, e.g. the Epistles of Seneca, the Meditations of Marcus Aurelius. The idea of reason (Providence) immanent in the universe was the motive sadly lacking in the old formalistic religion. Though too intellectual for popular consumption Stoicism was yet a finer creed than any Rome had yet known. Its notion of immanence, plus the influx of the mystery religions, strongly affected Roman paganism and set the stage for the Christian experiment.

From the third century A.D. Stoicism lost its impact and ceded its place to Neoplatonism which transferred the spirit of Stoicism to the Platonic universe. Stoicism had taught that even if one could not control the uncontrollable factors, he might still have freedom as to the attitude to take toward them. Neoplatonism was not interested in controlling or using such factors; it preferred escape. The turn philosophy had taken under the Stoics and Epicureans toward an ethico-moral emphasis was further augmented under the Empire in the growth

of Neoplatonism. Its attitude stemmed from the waning of the classical Hellenistic dream and the disappointment and frustration which followed the age of the Antonines.

This mood of depression and pessimism flowing from man's inability to find a sure footing spiritually and intellectually in his world was reflected in the surge of religious interest we have noted above. Neoplatonism displayed in its development this distrust of reason as the only answer. We have seen it in Carneades' trust in forms of revelation, divine or otherwise, using mystical experience and gnosis in place of conclusions from reason which skepticism considered without validity. Carneades' theory of probability, a new philosophical method which led to withholding judgment, was a fine basis for scientific development; but given the state of abstract thought at the time, it could also lead, as it did, to obscurantism and superstition. This theory, transmitted through Cicero, strongly influenced the spiritual tone of imperial life and helped produce the religious revival we are now considering in its impact upon Neoplatonism and Roman religion.

The Neoplatonists succeeded to the riches of the Academy, the Porch, and Lyceum. They were destined to provide philosophical concepts of great importance to Christian theologians, chiefly through the instrumentality of Plotinus (d.269A.D.) and gave Augustine the basis of his Christian philosophy. Augustine himself attributes his discovery of the spiritual nature of God to the Neoplatonists (CD 9.10ff). Plotinus himself,

XUM

however, in regard to the religious ideas of the Near East and its ritualism, showed little interest, but did propound the so-called doctrine of ecstacy, a unification of the Self with the One, independent of divine aid, a route which Augustine found eventually sterile in his own case. (Conf. 7.17.23; De Trin. 8.2.3).[21]

The Neoplatonist tradition of Plotinus and Porphyry became that of the Latin West, pagan and Christian, especially those elements of it which depended on accepting revelation in faith, an acceptance based on a life of moral authority and austerity or ascesis. Still, the use of such spiritual athletics stemmed from the bankruptcy of Neoplatonism in attaining through reason to the One, the supreme reality. Its exponents were examples of the turning of the times to religion, faith and arcane revelations, using such exercises to attain happiness and immortality outside the workings of rational procedures.

Into this same void left by the failure of philosophy and its evolution into a quasi-mysticism stepped the mystery religions of the East. Philosophy then combined with Oriental and Near Eastern cults to influence the Roman pagan cults, and both appear to be strongly influenced by sidereal religions as well. Not surprisingly, since both philosophy and the mysteries had the same provenance and had passed through the Hellenistic cultural shaping: Plotinus was an Egyptian, and Iamblichus, Porphyry, and Libanius were Syrians.

This domination of the mystery religions over philosophy

XUM

is seen in the way the latter subordinated its theories to the doctrines of the cults. The subsequent wedding of these two elements made a lasting impact on Roman paganism as it confronted the fourth-century Christian. One element in the wedding was the use of sacred books, revelations, such as the Chaldaic Oracles mentioned above. The use of such materials of various beliefs and ethnic provenances led to a gradual moulding by philosophy in a syncretic process of works and cults to produce a very different religion for Romanitas from that of the world of Augustus. Part of such syncretism was the acceptance of practices, cults, and beliefs which boasted a great antiquity like that of the cults of Cybele, of the Egyptian Isis, of the Persian Mithras. By the third century A.D., Mithras and Attis were one with the Sun in common worship, and scientific astrology boasted credentials to give them respectability.

Reliance upon revelation was supplemented by enthusiastic practice of asceticism by Neoplatonist philosophers and Stoics as well. Practices like fasting, sexual continence as purification, and penance were used to attain freedom for one's immaterial soul, and extended to devotees of the mysteries as well. But, it is noteworthy that many of the Neoplatonists and mystery followers put the practice of civic virtue, interest in the good of the commonwealth, last in their endeavors, a far cry from the philosophy of the Roman Stoic gentleman of Scipio's day.

This lack of interest in the present welfare of man and the

state was linked with belief in immortality of the soul and of an afterlife promised by the various cults. Roman pagans showed lively interest in personal survival: Aulus Gellius, Lucan, Seneca speak of ghosts and magic and necromancy (Noctes Atticae; Pharsalia; Agamemnon). Christianity will enter into this milieu with the strength of its clear promise of personal immortality in corporeal form, emphasizing its historical Resurrection-event. That promise spoke to men in search of happiness in the late 2nd-century world on into the period of Augustine, a world of depression, anarchy, fear, frustration, determinism, political breakdown, philosophical skepticism, and Roman mismanagement and inability to provide a milieu for the beata vita.

Roman religion, then, by 390 A.D. presented an amazing pantheon of cults, beliefs, practices, cultural, ethnic, and political accretions; Greek, Etrurian, Oriental, Hellenistic, and Roman. Part of its practice had been turning to savior gods to save the res publica, personified in an Augustus, an international, ecumenical ruler, and his successors. These men used all the ammunition provided by the psychological needs of the age to make the role of the emperor that of dominus et deus, nomos empsuchos (living law), seen later in Diocletian and Constantine. For many of his subjects the emperor was a present god, and his worship became an integral--if fateful for the Christian--part of Roman state cult.

Erwin Goodenough has stressed the influence of Pythagorean

ideas on the political philosophy which saw the ruler as king, particularly the Hellenistic ruler termed nomos empsuchos, law animate. The king was considered to be the state itself, its constitution, and its bond with the cosmos for his people. Goodenough feels that fragments of such writers in Stobaaus show a strong religious and political philosophy of royalty during the Hellenistic period. This concept surely influenced the Roman emperor in his contact with those monarchies.[22] Dio Chrysostom well represents this theory, and Eusebius is his heir. On the other hand, Rome also fell heir to the Oriental tradition of the sacred ruler, one as ancient as civilization itself.

Although Romans within the Italian peninsula clung to republican forms, the emperor received worship in the eastern provinces as the inscriptions show well. Cochrane has noted that although we may view emperor cult as an Oriental import in Hellenistic dress, it was a logical part of the cult of power, trust in the virtus and fortuna of the strong man. Furthermore, in such worship eclectic characteristics of paganism only made room for another savior god; in fact, the state added another each time a "good" emperor died and was made divus. Of course this only occurred if he had not taken thought to have that done before his demise (Gaius, d.41A.D.).

Gradually the Hellenistic forms of kingship helped modify Roman imperial office and court so that genuflections, salutations, and attitudes matched the heyday of Hellenistic royalty.

One such element from the Orient which deeply affected Christianity was the custom noted by Pliny (Ep.Traj.96) of worshipping before the Emperor's statue, and later even, through the practice of sycophancy in desperation for its life, before his person. Charlesworth sees this act as a test of religious conformity and as a heritage from Domitian.[23] Tertullian, among others, in his De idolatria, gives us but one instance of the problems that arose for Christians in their attitude toward the state and emperor worship.

As Roman religion was bombarded, or rather, infiltrated, by such extrinsic elements, it is significant in the light of Augustine's attack upon it, that official Roman religion, no matter how modified, could not substitute Latin culture in the East for native worship and cultural forms. Nor, of course, was it any more successful in Africa.[24]

Two further points should be noted. First, as we see Roman religion infiltrated by the Hellenized mystery religions and their influence upon the political image of the emperor, it is easy to regard this influence as a degradation of the native innocence of Roman pagan cult. The Oriental religions, though sometimes exhibiting the appearance of savagery, were actually a more advanced type in the evolution of religious forms than the national Roman cults. Cumont calls them "less primitive, less simple...provided with more organs than the old Graeco-Roman idolatry."[25] Secondly, I agree with Carcopino's insistence that the reason the cults so resemble one another is not

some pre-established harmony in their Oriental roots, but that their journey to Rome via Greece and Hellenized cosmopolitan centres had Hellenized them (Judaism and Christianity are no exceptions) so that they were easily assimilated by Romans steeped in that same Hellenistic culture and civilization.[26]

Rant as they might from Cato to Juvenal to Symmachus against foreign infiltration, pagan Romans, upholders of the pristine State cult, championed a religion whose theology was more dead than alive, whose worship was cold, prosaic, lacking in involvement of the total personality, without emotion and enthusiasm in an age which cried out for salvation, escape from determinism, and experience of solidarity. Noting these psychological factors, we must turn our attention if only briefly to the "towering phenomenon of imperial social history," as Chester Starr expresses it: the liberation of the individual from old ties and supports as the Empire brought to its catastrophic conclusion the individualizing movement of the ancient world.[27]

Human history is inextricably bound up with the vagaries, the peregrinations of the human will. We are here in the area of human motivation sought within the psychological changes of ancient man. He had lost his political significance under the emperor of the Romans, and was in an exposed, liberated, individual position. Greek idealism had considered nature first, then moved to an explanation of man as of like substance; the individual was merely a type, the type of an ideal, and time

had no meaning in such a cyclic and pantheistic milieu. This idealist Platonic theory, simply confirming the tendency of classical civilization, and of Romanitas, in particular, was not seriously challenged until Christianity. Philosophers had advised man to build an interior fortress, as we have seen above, for the state and even the family provided no support: this man, then, was subject only to the laws of nature; his freedom, however, was for himself, not for others. The Cynics alone in the moral reform they advocated seen in an Epictetus, expressed the need to speak to the needs of others, yet they exemplify the highest peak of individualism in the culture.

The second century was a plateau of sterility in literature, art, and architecture, though encompassed in material prosperity. The only healthy communal supports in such a period were found in Christianity and the army. Suicide, the touchstone of individualism, signaled the breakdown of communal life throughout society. Christianity broke through the gloom of the second century and led into the third: a horror of internal dissension and external invasion. It presented two tenets which no current philosophy or religion seemed to supply: 1) it promised immortality to all; 2) it was based on love, including a startling love of humanity.[28] It had a message for the poor, weak, the publican and the sinner, a hope different from any Hellenism could offer.

It must be noted that the chaos of the third century: political, social, economic, stemmed from the intellectual, psycho-

logical decline of the second. Yet, somehow, the old Graeco-Roman educational system held together long enough to ensure Augustine the training which would enable him to proclaim the new culture along with the new Gospel. It is interesting that this period might be likened to the 100-year gestation period Dawson mentions as necessary for the birth of a new culture.

In spite of such chaos, then, the fourth century saw the dawning of modern thought, a tremendous psychological development of man and advance of the human striving for answers to man's quest for the good, true, beautiful, eternal. This period from A.D. 300 is sometimes termed Late Classical or Transcendental. It witnessed the essential individuality of man breaking forth, a release of the human seen in the psychological development of man, an intellectual shift denoting human advance.

The rise of a new system of thought is evident in the third century, with rumblings in the second: the movement from rational mediation to metaphysical contemplation which allowed for the expression of weaknesses, of development, and conversion to some new way of life under such transcendental influence.

The roots of such a realistic assessment of man's condition lie far back in the causes for the decay of Romanitas in the 2nd and 3rd centuries, chief among these that of the isolation of the individual and his inability to support himself in an isolated position. Substitutes, sops, even, had been offered him by imperial civilization: 1) the political ideal of a world state composed of brothers, 2) material well-being for

XUM

body and emotions: corn dole, circuses, amphitheatre, mystery cults; 3) intellectual attainment: man separated from nature and his own body, and left to purely natural or rational exploration of his fate and destiny.[29]

Yet, from the pessimism of the 2nd-3rd centuries came the truer assessment of the nature of man and a deeper recognition of his dependence on his fellows which laid the groundwork psychologically for the preaching of the Gospel. Eventually throughout the period of the 4th-5th centuries, Christianity effected a transformation, but one which was indeed like the mustard-seed. For Augustine, in A.D. 390 in North Africa, the growth of the plant was a green promise.

It was as an answer to such psychological needs that the mystery religions, and Christianity among them, attracted many. They involved men in life-areas starved in the formalism of the state cult. Obviously, they appealed strongly and differently to the senses and emotions; certainly, to the conscience. Through respectability provided by philosophy, they acquired an appeal to the intelligence as well. As Cumont sees it, "a great religious conquest can be explained only on moral grounds."[30] It is this moral aspect that Hatch also stresses when he notes the age in which Christianity grew as one of moral reform.[31] He bases his argument upon the writings of Epictetus, in particular, who was little interested in the theoretical side of philosophy, except for theology, and so emphasized the place of ethics in philosophy as a way of life requiring practice and

discipline, part of the change of emphasis we have seen in the schools of the Empire: from moral philosophy to religion.

Part of this revival in an age of materialism was the conviction that the practice of rites or liturgies was insufficient without personal piety. Salus began to mean the freeing of the soul on earth and its happiness hereafter, an idea which would affect Roman institutions on all levels: brotherhoods, funeral colleges, imperial coinage, and, of course, eventually, architecture, as a reflection of man's Weltanschauung.

The shift from the Parthenon, to Pantheon, to Basilica of Maxentius shows a movement toward expressing space which released the building from its foundations and ties with the ground, buildings which, by the medieval period, could give man a sense of his insignificance but as one with the infinite, one with the universe. Minerva Medica in Rome saw internal space consciously reflected in the exterior, with the distinction between facade and interior withering away, the whole a movement almost bursting the boundary of the physical ground plan, part of the spirit of the age (early 4th century, A.D.) which sought for space which dwarfed man, but immersed and identified him with itself. The road from Minerva to Santa Sophia is direct; the factor of infinitude had come with Christianity into the ancient world, and opened spiritual vistas through the crumbling walls of Greek materialism.[32]

Just as architecture sought to answer man's need to express himself in the bounding of space, these same needs in their

psychological and social aspects produced religious forms. In the 1st century Christianity began its leaven-like moulding of the Roman dough with conversions not confined to the lower classes (Paul, Phil. 4.22; Euseb. H.E.3.18). In the 2nd, Egyptian cults pour in; the 3rd sees the religious revival which benefits the Syrian mysteries and Aurelian will enthrone the captured images of Bel and Helios. In that same century Christianity and Mithraism are at odds, while the emperors seize upon the latter to support their theocratic absolutism.

It is hardly pure chance, then, hardly pure opportunism, that Constantine would give Christianity an opportunity to contribute to his plan for reconstruction of the shaky remains of the disastrous period from 235-285 A.D.

Finally, the Roman religion which undergirt the mystique of Romanitas appears to us, not in the idealized form of Horace's Odes or the Aeneid, but as a cultural entity, subject to historical development, much patched and mended, various in its amazing components as Augustine faced it in his battle to defend Christianity against the charge of responsibility for the debacle of 410 A.D. Certainly it was not the religion of ancient Rome, nor of the Republic, nor of the Antonines. Rather, Cumont feels that it

> now pretended to offer to all men a world conception which gave rise to a rule of conduct and placed the end of existence in the future life. It was more unlike the worship that Augustus had attempted to restore than the Christianity that fought it. The two opposed creeds moved in the same intellectual and moral sphere, and one could actually pass from

> one to the other without shock. By the time of Symmachus and Praetextatus, the members of the Roman aristocracy faithful to their ancestral gods did not have the mentality nor a morality very different from that of the adherents of the new faith who sat with them in the senate. The religious and mystical spirit of the Orient had slowly overcome the whole social organism and had prepared all nations to unite in the bosom of a universal Church.[33]

What I have tried to show in this section has been the exemplification from Roman imperial history of what happens when social life becomes separated from the religious impulse. Roman civilization was the carrier of Hellenistic civilization. By the time of Augustine, Romanitas was the expression of that wedding and that experience: the mystique of the value, the power, and the eternity of the Roman experiment under the Emperors. But that experiment inherited a dying civilization; Hellenistic society had already become separated from its religious basis when it was adopted into the body politic and cultural of the Romans. It was incapable, then, of invigorating or inspiring the subjects of that Empire; it offered them no philosophical and, above all, no moral basis for their striving for answers to the good, true, beautiful, eternal.

What happened, then, is the ever-recurring pattern: the elements in that society of the fourth-century which were most vital, most thoughtful, most sensitive, withdrew from the state, from society as from an evil, an abomination (Cf. John, Apocalypse). Augustine's hostility, his disillusionment merely mirrors that of Origen, Jerome, Athanasius, Paulinus of Nola --

and of countless thousands who fled to the desert for sustenance, or created solitudes in their hearts. In 1925 Dawson could say: "We are only beginning to understand how intimately and profoundly the vitality of a society is bound up with its religion. It is the religious impulse which supplies the cohesive force which unifies a society and a culture."[34]

We can apply that insight directly to the Romanitas Augustine encountered in Rome, Milan, Carthage, Hippo. In an age of spiritual alienation, he was one of those thinkers who saw his own separation from the culture and its civilization as a viable route, as a way to satisfy his search for truth, goodness, and love. That that route somehow led back into the political, cultural, social life of the time meant that the society he fled was now pursuing answers along his road, and Augustine, priest and bishop, would have to be Augustine, judge in the imperial courts, counselor to rulers, executor of imperial decrees, and protector of Roman citizens who had rapidly become his fellow-Christians. They were all on the crumbling Roman road that led into a new civilization, the early Middle Ages.

> The great civilizations of the world do not produce the great religions as a kind of cultural by-product; in a very real sense, the great religions are the foundations on which the great civilizations rest. A society which has lost its religion becomes sooner or later a society which has lost its culture.[35]

We have now sketched briefly the "thought" factor of Romanitas, noting some of the chief psychological, philosophical, and religious developments in that culture. Three other

aspects of culture combined to produce important features of Romanitas: the environmental-geographic, the economic, and the ethnic. The first two I shall treat here under the heading of Roman politico-economic history; the third, infra in Chapter III. Given the enormous data available on this topic, I hardly hope to treat it with any completeness, but sketch here those features of the Roman political story which bear upon the development of Romanitas and Augustine's attitudes toward it.

What were the facts which prepared for the African situation in which Augustine will find himself in the 4th century? That world of Augustine's Africa we will treat in Chapter III, but here we must note elements of the political factors which so strongly influenced the development of Romanitas in the Late Empire.

Before we trace these developments, we will look at the sources for the third century which bear on our topic, then those directly related to the period of our study (390-420). During the half century between 235 and 285 The Roman Empire, and classical civilization with it, underwent a shattering experience. Regrettably, however, the literary sources for this very important period which so shaped Augustine's time are hardly adequate. Herodian's superficial account covers 180-238. The only continuous narrative is the Historia Augusta, often useless because of its use of fictitious documents. Baynes has placed it in 362-3 as propaganda for Julian the Apostate;[36] it directly uses the Caesares of Aurelius Victor (A.d. 360)

but not Eutropius Breviarum ab urbe condita (369-370). For the years after 232, however, we have no continuous narrative, although the epitomizers and chroniclers like Victor and Eutropius give us some information. The former's Caesares covers the period from Augustus to Constantius; Eutropius's Breviarum ...treats material to 364, using Livy and Suetonius. It was used by Jerome and Orosius.

By far the most valuable piece of historical writing for the fourth century is that of the last true historian of the ancient world, the Greek-speaking soldier from Antioch who wrote in Latin the story of the Empire from Nerva down to 378. Unfortunately, the thirteen books down to 353 are lost; we have those from 353 to 378, Books 14 to 31. Ammianus Marcellinus shows historical perception in his continuation and imitation of Tacitus, but his technique and style betray isolation from the lives he treats. His narrative is vivid and he can strike a splendid phrase, but his work is sometimes marred with prolixity and ornament.

Zosimus's Historia Nova, written in Greek probably between 450 and 500, is the best account of the wars of Aurelian, and for our purposes, very useful for Zosimus's strong pagan bias in favour of the old gods; he attributes present disasters to their neglect. Yet, as a reliable source, he is difficult to use both as to chronology and treatment of his own sources. He supplements Ammianus for the years 270 to 410 A.D.

The new source of information comes from contemporary

Christian writers, especially, Eusebius of Caesarea's Historia Ecclesiastica and Lactantius's De mortibus persecutorum from the early fourth century. Lactantius is one of the few Christian writers to treat political and social matters, but without serious political analysis. Eusebius has preserved for us many original documents and makes full use of Alexandrian scholarship to serve the Church in the great tradition of Origen.[37] Eusebius's Chronica were followed by Jerome's which covered the period to 378 and made use of pagan writers like Aurelius Victor and Eutropius, for the Christians had no compilation comparable to Eutropius's work, and by the end of the fourth century they began to feel the need for such when pagan histories of Rome were growing in popularity. Sulpicius Severus combined pagan and biblical sources about 400 in his life of Martin, bishop of Tours (372 to 397), and Orosius, at Augustine's request (c.417), wrote a summary history of Rome in support of the De civitate Dei, giving what Momigliano calls "the final Christian twist to the pagan epitome of history."[38]

Augustine's own De civitate Dei makes much sense in this company, and was openly in the spirit of the age wherein Eusebius gave us a new genre of ecclesiastical history, for its documentation quite different from the pagan historians, emphasizing the remote past and doctrinal struggles. After Eusebius, Christians remain concerned with chronography as the type of instruction in the 4th century; this concern with a pattern of history, and not its details, is seen later in Augustine's De

civitate Dei.[39] Athanasius gave us Christian biography in his Life of St. Anthony (360). Both Eusebius and Athanasius, of course, had highly apologetic goals in mind: doctrinal tradition, Christian example, and the fight against persecution and heresy. When Eusebius tried to write the Life of Constantine, however, some twenty years before Athanasius's work he was caught in the problem of providing a model picture, difficult at the best, and eliminating all the paraphernalia of pagan biography: pomp, success, glory. Momigliano notes that Einhard went back to Suetonius for his life of Charlemagne. Eusebius had too hard a struggle.[40] Yet, Eusebius and Athanasius, along with Augustine, gave the death blow to pagan historiography and gradually eliminated any biography other than hagiography. Possidius, bishop of Calama, will write the life of his hero, Augustine, in this tradition, and in 422, Paulinus eulogized his bishop, Ambrose, in a vita which is our only extant source for his early years.

For the reign of Theodosius the historical sources are weak, but Christian works in hagiography and theology abound in East and West. However, the codes are rich for the entire period, as is the contemporary literature: orations of Themistius and Libanius, sermons and letters of Basil to 379, of Gregory of Nyssa to about 394; Gregory of Nazianzus to about 390, and John Chrysostom's sermons and works for the Eastern Empire.

Correspondence is, of course, a major source: Ambrose,

XUM

to 397, gives illuminating materials for the imperial houses and relations with the Church. Augustine's own Confessions give us Africa, and Milan, plus the whole story of his episcopal correspondence, (see below) as does Jerome for Rome and Palestine. Pagan correspondence is equally rich: Ausonius, Gratian's tutor provides verse and panegyrics; Q. Aurelius Symmachus, to 402, the social context of the pagan aristocrat.

For the early fifth century we have a fairly full narrative for 394-410 in the last two books of Zosimus, following Eunapius to 404, but his work ends in 410, while Olympiodorus's work from 407 to 425 is found only in the use of him by Zosimus and Sozomen. Only Orosius is a source for secular affairs but he stops in 417. From there on we have only annalistic chronicles and rather unreliable Byzantine sources. Church history, like Theodoret's Historia Religiosa, ceases after Theodosius II in 408; Sozomen goes on to 425, and Socrates down to 439. Only Evagrius gives us the later period from 431 to 594.[41]

Yet, the legal sources are good. The Theodosian code published in 438 used materials from the previous forty years. We have, also, the canonical letters of the popes and the acts of the councils, e.g. the verbatim records of Constantinople and of First Council of Ephesus in 431, a vivid picture of the problems which had built up in the years of Augustine's episcopacy.

Literary works, works monumental enough to perdure and influence later generations, not to speak of their preeminent

cultural and intellectual value as contemporary sources, we see in Plotinus's Enneads, published by Porphyry c. A.D. 305 which Starr calls "the greatest work of the century,"[42] and Augustine's De civitate Dei completed c. 427 A.D., and his Confessions, c. 401, a work which Harnack called that of a religious genius whose work is immortal.

An overview of the historical sources above show us the paucity of such, and we must rely for chronology on other available evidence: inscriptions, papyri, coins, and the dating of imperial constitutions. Here, the third century again suffers, for the economic crisis left few funds for inscriptions (Frend gives us the African story later). In this light, the constitutions of Theodosius II and Justinian become even more important, and for the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries the writings of the Fathers of the Church and the wealth of Christian literature of the time become ever more important. Jones's use of such materials for the Later Empire gives us the man in the street for this period as we see him in no other period of ancient history.[43] Brown calls Jones's Survey the first social history of the established Christian Church.

Coinage tells us the story of the period, mirroring the State in its religious and symbolical aspect as well. Mattingly calls it "a continuous exposition of the policy of the Empire presented before the bar of public opinion."[44] It gives us the mood in which Rome of the third and fourth centuries faced

its own times. A great advantage of the coinage of the third century is that it is continuous, where the literary tradition as we have seen, is quite broken, and is the only surviving continuous source for the third century. Septimius Severus increased the base metal in the denarius to almost 50 per cent; Caracalla issued the double denarius at less than its proper weight, and by mid-third century, it was a copper coin coated with silver. Inflation was so extreme after A.D. 250 that in some areas barter was used. Diocletian thoroughly reformed the coinage in 294, issuing from 15 mints gold, silver and bronze coins, and finally Constantine, the gold solidus, to be used for a thousand years in the Mediterranean. However, in the fourth century trade and industry dwindled, especially in the West, coinage was again inflated, and taxation soared. Here the Theodosian Code reflects the State's drive to stop change which it could neither handle nor understand and to provide funds for an impoverished government: "No man shall possess any property that is tax-exempt," (Theod. Code 13.10.8- A.D. 383) an edict with a modern ring! On the other hand, evidence from inscriptions and archeology falls off swiftly across the fourth century as part of the picture of economic and physical decline.

From this necessarily brief listing of written and unwritten sources for the period: mid-third to early fifth century A.D. we can see a broad spectrum of mingling pagan and Christian philosophies and theologies. Such a mingling

was a valid reflection of the intellectual life of the period wherein the old and new cultures were in confrontation, but, also, in process of mutual absorption and communication. Let us now trace somewhat of the Roman political and economic history which encased this cultural development of which Augustine was so much a part.

The Roman political story is mirrored, also, in its constitutional and economic history. The patchwork pattern of the Republican legal and political system did not suffice for the government of the Empire, and as we noted above, so after 100 years of strife, Augustus as _princeps_ provided the strong executive force needed to organize the protection of the _patria_ and the provinces, to provide _pax et securitas_. His _auctoritas_ arose from the fact that he had provided such a peace, and through his successors he set up a bureaucracy to make his legal power effective. Furthermore, his new order seemed justified by its results: invasions ceased, the frontier was gradually secured, private industry soared, personal safety was provided, communication was good, transportation made possible, the budget balanced, and taxes were not exorbitant. First century prosperity led into an even more prosperous second, especially, in the provinces. But Italy began to feel the bite of economic decline caused by overproduction, and the late second and early third centuries witnessed less productivity because of internal dissension, war, and disease, with the corresponding rise in sums expanded to finance the military

XUM

and the bureaucracy; bankruptcy threatened the Roman state.

Yet the Empire survived thanks to the work of reconstruction of men like Claudius Gothicus, Diocletian, and Constantine, but the new state was entirely different from that of the Principate or the Dominate. And the causes were economic as well as social. The city-life of the Empire was a facade, masking the weak basis of urban civilization, made up of a society of consumers using slave labor and rural serfs. Rome was a leach on the body politic draining way the economic power of the Empire in non-productive building and in feeding and amusing the cosmopolis. At the same time urbanization led to the decline of citizen classes who were quite sterile and so provided no proper military force, but had to rely on rural peoples, provincials, and barbarians to defend the Empire and its limites.[45]

No wonder that external invasion and internal dissension were insoluable problems for the Emperor, the army, and the provinces, and that the municipalities once so supportive in taxes, were ruined in the ensuing financial debacle. The army ruled without competition in the dreadful period from the death of Severus Alexander to the accession of Diocletian (235-285 A.D.). In this period took place what Dawson calls "a social and constitutional revolution of the most far-reaching kind...the great break in the history of the ancient world,[46] the end of the old society and the inauguration of the new order." When that period ended with the aid of the Illyrian

emperors, the Empire was changed, none of the former governmental elements was now strong enough to establish adequate organization. The result had to be government based upon compulsion. Diocletian based his reorganization of the constitutional foundations upon Hellenistic and Oriental models, such as that of Egypt and the Empire became a huge centrally-controlled bureaucratic state, with compulsory service and a fixed caste system. Ultimately, the peasants and curiales alike were bound to land and town, and were responsible for taxation corporately; the servile state replaced the Roman political model, the city-state, but the crisis was over for a time.

Constantine introduced gold coins, the solidi, the ultimate basis for the fiscal system and private transactions.[47] But a debased currency held for everyday transactions, and the middle class grew impoverished as they helped pay for an army of 500,000 men. Only the great landowners on their latifundia were strong enough to hold their own against the tax-collector and the bureaucracy. These fourth-century landowners were mainly of the senatorial class--a great change from the third, when they were in decline, but they had meanwhile absorbed the knights and become the most powerful clique in the Empire. In the West, in particular, they monopolized what was left of civilized life outside the Church and played an increasing part in the Church itself. Classical culture lived on in their ranks as did paganism seen in a Symmachus or a Mamertinus. Some of them joined the ranks of the Christian church of the

house of Constantine or Theodosius. And with good reason. In a declining moribund economy empty of political opportunity, the Church offered an escape from State authority for a cleric, and the exercise of power for a bishop. Compared to the increasingly static, uncreative, and powerless state, the Church was, as yet, flexible, developing, and increasingly successful. The best men chose to work for the better firm - the Church: Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Hilary, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, and Chrysostom, to name the greatest.

Another result of the acute crisis of the third century which must be mentioned here in connection with its far-reaching results was the manpower shortage, a result of the wars, famine and plagues of the years 235-285 A.D. Agriculture was hard-hit for workers; landowners vied for them and they traveled to find better wages; the government panicked, and the legislation of Diocletian fixed the peasant to the land, the soldier and his son to the army, the decurion to his curia. Yet the change of most import for the future of Christianity was that of the formation of the new imperial nobility of service, not hereditary, but men from all ranks of society, subservient to the emperor and loyal to him and in sympathy with his religious policy. Imperial favor to the new religion could not go unnoticed, and, of course, there were many cases of interested conversions which Eusebius decries.[48] This new aristocracy of service was part of a great social as well as religious change in the fourth century which strongly affected the middle

and lower classes as well as the above-mentioned ranks of the aristocracy, the senatorial order.

The men who influenced the political course of the changes noted above were Augustus, the founding father of Romanitas, Domitian, the Antonines, the Severi, Aurelian, Diocletian, Constantine, and Theodosius the Great. We have seen many of the changes attributed to the Julian House, as well as to those of the Flavian and Antonine lines, but for our purpose of Augustine's immediate backgrounds, the dynasties of Constantine and of Valentinian and Theodosius must be noted, for the changes wrought by these men strongly influenced the shape of the Romanitas to which Augustine would react from A.D. 390-420; no less did they affect the Church.

Constantine became master of the West at the Mulvian bridge on 28 October, A.D. 312 and inherited the problems which faced Diocletian upon his accession in 284: 1) how to stop the continual military coups which led to imperial assassinations. This he solved, but at the cost of civil war; 2) the Christians; he failed in this, but Constantine repaired the mistake; 3) the economy: to restore the declining population, commerce and agriculture of the Empire. Both Diocletian and Constantine failed in this last.[49]

Constantine carried beyond Diocletian the autocratic aspects of his imperial office, and based his rule upon divine sanction, assuming in 325 A.D. the diadem, a narrow band about the head, the emblem of autocratic power for both Eastern and

Hellenistic Kings. To serve him he expanded both the bureaucracy and the army and built himself a new city as seat of Empire, Constantinople. Undoubtedly his greatest achievement in moulding Romanitas was initiating the process of transforming the Roman Empire from a pagan to a Christian state, a task which earned for him the title of saint from the Eastern Orthodox Churches as well as isapostolos, "equal of the Apostles." In spite of his excellent generalship, energetic defense of the limites and far-sighted espousal of the Christians, his policies helped hasten the disintegration of the Empire.

Constantine's successors, with the exception of Julian, carried on his policy of interference in Christian affairs and the use of the Church's influence to help the declining State. Along with their father they instituted a relationship between the now burgeoning Church and their own imperial persons which gradually shaped the images of both emperor and Church, and refurbished some of the divine pretensions of Romanitas as to the eternity and destiny of the Empire, all the while quite unconsciously posing the question of the exact role of the Church in relation to the Empire, a question which will draw upon the best energies of Augustine.

The house of Valentinian and Theodosius the Great (364-395 A.D.) had as co-founders Valentinian I and his brother, Valens, and finally, a third Augustus, his son Gratian (367 A.D.). All of them were burdened with the defense of the Empire against the barbarians, and Valens lost his life in the

disaster of Adrianople (378) when the Goths overran the Balkans. Their plight did little to build the concept of imperial divinity or the Roman myth of eternal destiny. It was, finally, in the reign of Theodosius I (379-395 A.D.) that Church and Empire met face to face in the persons of Ambrose of Milan and the Emperor Theodosius and the Western Church began to shape that attitude and policy which would influence Augustine's view of the claims of Romanitas. In Theodosius we find the first Roman emperor to bow to the claims of an authority which appealed to a power greater than his own. A precedent had been established, one not lost upon Augustine who was ordained priest just one year later (391 A.D.). When Theodosius died at Milan early in 395, Augustine was consecrated for a role symbolic of the new life in the dying culture: bishop of African Hippo. The figure of the bishop will loom ever larger in the period of the Later Empire as representative of the old culture, often, through his education, and of the new spiritual group, through his office. He was the bridge into the early medieval civilization of the West. But, as of the time of Augustine, Dawson sees no such blend yet achieved, but three diverse elements existing in the culture and political life of the later Empire: 1) the Christian Church as an independent spiritual authority: 2) the city-state, with its Hellenistic traditions of culture; 3) the Empire, a combination of Oriental sacred monarchy and bureaucratic collectivism.[50]

Still, the bonds between the Church and Empire were growing

ever tighter, for the Church saw authority and hierarchy as indispensable for the peace and order she needed in her work. So, gradually, a world political force seemed a perfect complement for the spiritual unity envisioned by many of the early Christian writers, e.g. Eusebius, Prudentius, and Melito of Sardis.[51] These views were confined to a small group, however, for the average Christian of the lower classes experienced political oppression, taxation, corruption of officials, and alienation from the imperial power. The senatorial classes and rich landowners, in general, identified themselves with the glorious pagan past of Rome, a fact with strong political implications, for this adherence led them to fight Christianity on all levels, and even to try to reinstitute pagan worship as did Flavian Nicomachus in 392-394 A.D. in Rome. The revolt of those years used as its figurehead the rhetorician, Eugenius, again an act highly symbolic of the still-close union between classical culture and political power.[52]

Political hopes for the conservative, senatorial party died forever in the Sack of Rome by Alaric in A.D. 410 and a new political force had to be considered: the barbarians. What was their role in the governance of the Empire, what, their relationship to the Christian Church? From 395 to 493 A.D. Roman resistance to their power broke down completely. The real power in the Empire from Honorius onward was in the hands of military dictators, masters of the soldiers, often barbarians themselves, and they succeeded one another while

XUM

the Emperor ruled with nominal authority. The roles were reversed: the "eternal" Emperor and his cultured senators were now subjects of the uncultured Germans, Visigoths and Vandals. Hardly a situation to encourage the myth of Romanitas, when Theodosius II paid King Rua of the Huns an annual tribute, and Attila claimed both gold and the overlordship of Theodosius II!

The vicious circle of barbarian pressures, wars and famine, manpower shortage, fewer agricultural workers, government fixing of the colonate to the soil (354-430 A.D.) - all these continued and intensified throughout Augustine's lifetime. One group alone, as we have seen, seemed able to break out of the circle: the great landowners who could operate their estates using the coloni now rapidly approaching serfdom. They exercised over them powers of police and jurisdiction, and flaunted their power in the face of the local magistrates and even imperial agents. Gruadually small, helpless individuals or villages placed themselves under the patronage of such a senatorial landholder, and became his tenants. In actual fact, the great landowners became the heirs of the Empire - its sole stable economic power. Jones has some telling pages about the very possible collusion of this group with the newly created powerful bureaucracy in tying the coloni to their estates.[53] His comments on the conditions of the peasants are highly informative, also.

One significant aspect of this independence and position

was, of course, their classical training: pagan rhetoric, philosophy, poetry, and oratory associated with the education of the rich. Thus this class maintained a solidarity of shared culture and enlightenment firmly rooted in their so-called glorious past. They were to a man "laudatores temporis acti." They worshipped the past and explored antiquarian lore, commenting on Virgil, even reviving pagan worship and ancient customs - men like Symmachus, Servius and Donatus. As their world died they clung more tenaciously to these classical relics. Such men abhorred the new men, the Christians, and their barbarous writings, their uncultured religion, their lower and middle class constituency. Towards the end of the fourth century the conservatives will use their rhetorical training to persuade political rulers to re-institute pagan religion and worship, and their word was influential; their number, in powerful positions.

The future, however, belonged to the Christians, but at the end of the fourth century, the pagan elite were the present and strongly reviving opposition to the Christian Church. Momigliano cites the change which the political crisis following Theodosius's death produced: "pagans became more aggressive and dared to say openly that the new religion was responsible for the collapse of the Empire."[54] Christians were now on the defensive. Pagans renewed their study of Livy, Sallust, Tacitus and imitated them. Pagan criticism was strong but prudently cited; only Eunapius[55] is strongly anti-Christian

but he reflects the changed mood at this time when pagans could no longer trust themselves to hopes of Christian tolerance for their beliefs: Theodosius's Edict of Thessalonica (380) required all men to be Christians, considering all others "madmen," and by 396 all pagan cults were outlawed.

This view of the political transformation of the Empire shows us a change from a government offering some degree of social mobility to all classes to one in which that mobility was being destroyed by a caste system as we have seen above.[56] The imperial power saw its subjects, especially its provincials, as workers or taxpayers to support the bureaucracy and the army, both often corrupt. Escape was found only in the urban proletariat, army, civil-service, church, senatorial class --or the desert. Yet it was corrupt bureaucracy which permitted enough flexibility to make such escape possible! Meanwhile, forces within the culture and political order worked to produce the permanent division of the western and eastern halves of the Empire. Imperial unity and Roman might were fictions hard to preserve.

CHAPTER II

Paideia tou Kuriou

Dawson was much concerned with the relationship of sociology and history. He saw them related as general biology to the study of organic evolution; he felt that sociology dealt with the structure of society; history, with its evolution; the sociologist would define the form of a culture; the historian, its content.[1]

As I look for the origin of the mechanism which imparted a characteristic form to the ésprit de corps manifested by Romanitas, I am reminded of his remarks: Romanitas existed through the success of its educational form: its system of Hellenistic paideia translated into humanitas. Here we face the mystique of Hellenism itself seen in the pervasive culture of the educated classes of the Later Roman Empire. This interesting fact then raises the question: Why Hellenism in a Romanized world? Volumes have been written in response, but our concern here will confine us to a brief glance at: 1) pagan educational theory and practice, 2) what the Christian Church did to inculcate its own beliefs, and 3) the Later Empire, particularly its fourth century phase, which witnessed an actual renaissance of Graeco-Roman literature in the work of the Fathers of the Church: a fusion of Christianity and Hellenistic culture.

The renaissance took place in what has been called a

declining civilization, and rivers of ink have traced the source and course of such a decline: Gibbon to A.H.M. Jones, whom Peter Brown calls the author of "not a complete social history of the Later Roman Empire, but the first, irreplaceable chapter in the history of the Byzantine State."[2] I am intrigued by the fact that both Werner Jaeger and A.H.M. Jones bring their more optimistic views of such decline from an attitude toward the Later Empire that looks out of a window in Santa Sophia: both look westward from an Eastern perspective.[3] Their views seem to confirm Dawson's earlier stance in seeing Hellenism as a form of super-culture or world civilization whose vitality perdured in spite of declines political or economic. Such civilizations perdure "unless destroyed by atom bombs or absorption by another world civilization."[4]

Significantly, Dawson saw a "civilization" as going beyond the bounds of the regional culture in which it originated, whereas Spengler used the term to apply to the first period of decline of a culture. So, Dawson will see Hellenism marching on after the demise of the Athenian state and the vagaries and metamorphoses of the Roman Empire. This last phase, the Late Empire, is for him the civilization's most infectious stage, the time of its greatest seminal importance for the future, because Hellenism, through the form of its imposition, its educational mould, its <u>paideia</u>, became the direct means of cultural formation for the Roman world since it could be taught to non-Greeks. This inner strength allowed it to

transcend the breakdown of a particular people or region. It also permitted its assimilation by peoples and groups who could add their characteristic enrichment to Hellenism. "Hellenism" names the civilization which gave definitive form to the system of paideia, the Greek form of education which took final shape in the period after Alexander the Great and Aristotle, and became the educational system of the Roman Empire. Gradually, it became more and more an education of the book and the school, so much so that we find it still alive at the heart of the later scholastic system, so-called.

When we study the educational system of the fourth-century Empire, we find the values of Hellenism still alive in its spirit and methodology, for Roman education as such did not exist as a separate entity, although there were Latin characteristics, but, in general, it merely adapted Hellenistic education to its own exigencies. Christianity entered that picture, of course, but as we shall see, it did not create an educational revolution insofar as the form of Hellenistic education is concerned, but combined with it to produce a new culture, that of the patristic.

European civilization is dependent upon its religious foundation, certainly, but not immediately, for then the change made by the Reformation, e.g., should have produced both a fundamental and a superficial change in the culture. This did not happen.[5] Only by schools is culture directly determined and Christianity used the scholastic system for centuries to

produce European culture. The source of that system was Homer, its mainstream: Plato and Isocrates, its tributaries: Aristotle, Plotinus, Origen, and one Western branch: Augustine.

This system based upon the book and the word owed its perdurance to the factor of language, the most basic element in a culture, and, again, that language could be taught, for the language of the Roman Empire was for a long time two: Greek and Latin. Education had become bi-lingual, a fit vehicle for an imperial people. Yet it must be remembered that, on the whole, "it was only a thin upper crust which was Latinised or Hellenised...when we speak of the culture of the Empire we are speaking of that of a very small minority...in many areas the bulk of the population could not understand either of the languages which were the vehicle of culture, and throughout the empire peasants and labourers, craftsmen and shopkeeper who formed the majority of the urban population were for the most part illiterate.[6] It was the upper and rising middle classes who preserved, practiced, and cherished the inheritance of Hellenistic education; it was their koine, their membership card in advanced circles both in the imperial bureaucracy and the senatorial order. It was the de facto religion of the fourth-century pagan educated man.

Our age with its fragmented concept of what constitutes education can hardly grasp just what paideia-humanitas meant to the fourth-century pagan. Its roots curled back into the "Heroic Age" of Phoenix's advice to the young Achilles "to

be a speaker of words and a doer of deeds" (Iliad 9.443). Its Ionian phase, with Athens as teacher of Hellas, had produced the masters: Plato, Isocrates, and the Sophists. Plato embodied the ancient philosophical ideal; Isocrates, the oratorical. The schools of the Hellenistic period followed, and Alexandria became the intellectual heart of the world, followed by Antioch, Pergamum, Rhodes, Athens, now moving toward specialization.

The Roman phase of paideia produced Cicero, the educated bilingual Roman who transformed paideia into humanitas with suitable cultural adaptations. Its goal was the citizen who combined theory with sound character formation and avoided an inferior specialization. Greek literature, art, philosophy, and manners conquered Rome and transformed her homespun educational system into the artes liberales. Quintilian saw rhetoric as specialization: form now became the chief emphasis and goal of education.

However, from the fourth century onward Greek gradually died in Western schools, and Christian education began to fill in the content of the Graeco-Roman form of education. It was not that the system had never contained such: religious and ethical ideas played a large part in both Greek and Roman education; Homer was the moral teacher as well as the cultural master of the ancient world. Music, poetry, and philosophy were ultimately formative of character, the character of the citizen of the polis, and later, of the res publica. The

study of Plato and Vergil was cherished because of their "philosophical religion," as well as their literary form.

However, concentration on form could not but increase as the forces which foster intellectual life failed to find sustenance in the culture of the Later Empire. Quintilian shows the beginning of that weakening which reflected the absence of strong political activity on the part of the citizen of the Empire, as well as his reaction to the psychological crises described supra in Chapter I: he was set adrift in an age of individualism, searching for answers to his ultimate questions from philosophy, literature, religion. In general, he found only empty forms.

The strife among the schools of philosophy was only aggravated by the attacks of the skeptics, such as Carneades, and the result was the eclecticism we see in Cicero and later, in Augustine himself. After the second century the Stoics provided no new ideas, and bore the stigma of being the only strictly philosophic school to countenance and justify belief in astrology and divination. The Neoplatonists alone in the person of Plotinus returned to metaphysical problems somewhat in the intellectual decline, and provided a system of thought to combat the Gnostics and the mystery religions. But he, too, tried to reconcile philosophical reasoning with recourse to a mystical experience of God, which his followers transformed into spiritualism and theosophy, yet they built a bridge between pagan philosophy and Christianity upon whose swaying

floor Origen, the Cappadocians, and Augustine were to walk into the full tide of Later Roman culture.

What was the form so indelibly stamped upon the students of the Later Empire? The shape of Hellenistic education? In general, pupils came to the rhetor after completing work with the grammaticus who had trained them in the science of correct speech and a study of the pagan classics; for the Roman: Vergil, Terence, Sallust, and Cicero, the quadriga; for the Greek: Homer, Euripides, Menander and Demosthenes. These authors were explicated line by line, committed to memory by the student, too often made the source of pedantic allusion for the rest of their lives. In spite of lip-service to mathematics and science (Cic. De oratore 1.72), the entire system tended to grammar, to rhetoric. In essence, it was a literary education.

The school of the rhetor specialized in oratory, and in the fourth century the sophists dominated the scene in Athens, Smyrna, Antioch, and Constantinople. The rhetor prolonged the curriculum of the grammaticus, but also inculcated rhetorical theory and its direct use in oratory, e.g. in the five divisions of oratory, the five divisions of a speech, the three kinds of style. "A clear and harmonious arrangement of both words and subject matter was essential, together with a judicious and varied use of the figures of speech and the figures of thought.[7] The demands of Cicero (De Or. 1.72) for the liberal arts, including a wider culture: history, law,

XUM

philosophy were not heeded, nor the pleas of Quintilian for the same. Law and philosophy remained specialities; it was Cicero's De inventione, not the De oratore that won the day.

A similar slacking off appeared in medicine which reached its peak in Galen (d.210); astronomy ends with Claudius Ptolemaeus; Iamblichus and Proclus made contributions to mathematics, but in place of inventiveness and creativity, the Late Empire was characterized by conformity to tradition, the preservation of the past, the work of the compiler and commentator -- all of these characteristic of other areas of study as well: literature, philosophy, and poetry.

Values in the parent culture are usually reflected by the schools a society sets up for preserving and handing down these very values. What value system was enshrined in the Hellenistic system of education we have noted briefly above? Much of it was Greek. A comment on the virtues in Chapter I above pre-supposed that these virtues would be reflected, also, in the direct inculcation of values which education normally performs in a culture. From our viewpoint so much in Graeco-Roman education stands open to criticism that we must make the effort to see that system from the viewpoint of the Later Empire, for otherwise, Augustine's reactions to the mystique of Romanitas will hardly be comprehensible when we investigate these below.

Along their historical path the Greeks came to believe that the aim of life was the creation of a higher type of man;

XUM

that effort was embodied in their educational system. They called that effort and system paideia, a consciously-held value and ideal. Above all, it was a formative principle. This concept of morphosis, a shaping principle, lies behind all Greek strivings for arete and the practice of the virtues. The shaping of the Greek character, of the whole man, was paideia. This germinal idea found expression, of course, in all the arts, but was especially embodied in literature, the truest expression of higher culture, hence Plato could urge the nation to philosophy, but in the end Isocrates won out, for Homer remained supreme and with him Aeschylus, Euripides, Sophocles, and Aristophanes. Jaeger felt that understanding this Greek approach to education and culture was vital for our understanding of what Christianity attempted to do in the area of education and of kerygma.

Along with the ideal of morphosis, the formative value of life and education, went the tendency to formalize, to see every object as part of a whole, to discover and formulate laws governing reality: reason combined with vision, to see the idea in everything as visible pattern, to discover objective standards and laws that gave new certainty to thought and action. Linked with this tendency was an awareness of the position of the individual in community, another germinal notion for the Christian experience. The Greeks actualized this individuality indirectly by the pursuit and search for laws we noted above; the individual had a place in this world-

ordering of theirs as part of a whole, and this notion governed all creative effort: sculpture, painting, literature.

From this source came the later Platonic idealism which eventually cast the individual in a typical role in society and ended with political calcification in the Roman period. Yet, it also laid the goundwork for the concept of the logos as common to all minds as is the law to every citizen. There was a natural principle governing human life and there were immanent laws by which man exercised his physical and intellectual powers. Using that knowledge as a creative force in paideia: shaping the living man; that was the bold creative notion developed by the Greeks: the greatest work of art was man. Education meant moulding human character in accord with the idea of arete as it evolved through the centuries. The intellectual principle of the Greeks was not individualism but humanism: the process of educating man into his true shape: morphosis. That was Greek paideia.[8]

Yet, it must always be remembered that this education also stressed continually that the essential character of a human being was his political character. Hence, the Greek trinity of poietes, politikos, sophos embodied the nation's highest ideal of spiritual liberty bound by deep knowledge to the service of the community. Until late in the 4th century, literature and art will express this spirit of the community. But the genuine force which shaped man and the world was always words, since the decisive factor in paideia was active

energy: man could not be educated by simply looking at art. Rather, the process by which the formation of human character was objectified would appear to them in a Sophocles as the climactic figure of Greek poetry in whom poetry and culture came together to create the idea of kaloskagathos: the Athenian gentleman of the 5th century B.C.

But short was the glory. In Euripides we see the effect of the mystique of power gone awry and preying upon the conscience of the sensitive man. The brutal enslavement of the Melians by his native Athens took place in 416 B.C. a year before he wrote the Troades, and his drama, in general, shows the change from belief in the polis and world-governing powers to a trust in man alone. He helped to destroy mythology and to create the Hellenistic man in whom the ideas pictured above lived on, but in forms which more and more were deprived of a faith-content or commitment, a development which was mirrored, of course, in the educational system. That is why attributing man's psychological emptiness merely to his loss of political initiative during the Empire period is a simplistic notion. The citizen of the Empire was part of the mainstream of Hellenistic thought. Augustus did not create the intellectual and emotional search for meaning. Perhaps Euripides was more truly parent. What the deprivation of political initiative did, certainly, was to empty education eventually of the content of live subject matter for rhetorical formation, and rhetoric was education. An examination of that phenomenon is in order, for

XUM

it is significant for Romanitas.

What rhetorical formation, the educational tool of Graeco-Roman culture, actually did was to use literature for its content -- a process quite in line with the tradition: the poet, the musician, the orator (statesman), and the philosopher were the chief purveyors of words in the Hellenistic world; in them literature reflected the process by which the Greek ideal of paideia shaped itself through the ages. When, then, Roman culture looked to the method by which to form citizens for the Empire, literature was without question the mould for the morphosis. Complex forces which we cannot analyze here so shaped the literary heritage that the rhetorical exercise enshrined the words and deeds of the glorious past and not the living, present, political, social or artistic content, and this was in keeping with ancient cultural ideals.

Marrou insists that we come to terms with this difference in values, for our age has been so concerned with training in techniques, skills, sometimes to the loss of the ideal of a general humanistic education. The Hellenistic paideia which nurtured Augustine's education still clung to the ideal of a well-rounded readiness for the kairos, e.g. whatever circumstances would call for in the educated man of the fourth-century world. The classicist strove to produce "a kind of indeterminate product of very high intrinsic quality ready to respond to any demand."[9] And, again, the aim was social: such a product could fit in anywhere in the imperial cosmos; Hellenistic

education was designed to unite men in a cultural fraternity of learning and common ideals; such was Cicero's humanitas. Symmachus was impelled by this same concept. Furthermore, the political, social, cultural reality of the fourth-century dictated such an education. The climate for it we have noted in Chapter I. Here we see that the loss of political freedom did have this determinant influence: men turned to the life of the mind, to the cultural, the aesthetic for sustenance. The rhetor's recitationes were the rage.

The aim of Roman education became that of realizing through literature and art the ideal of humanitas untouched by base technical considerations. In this light academic eloquence did not seem absurd; it was the highest form of art, for real life is not the sole source of man's inspiration; imagination has always been one of his means of access to spiritual life. Such a concept helps us understand how literature, mythological or otherwise, became the chief tool of Roman education since it was the embodiment of the word, logos, speech. And speech ensured communication among men; it produced a world in which men could understand each other: the same models, ideas, works of literature produced a like culture and broke through the isolation of the Hellenistic world in which man found himself adrift. Isolation from daily intercourse, even specialization, was suspect in the culture e.g. mathematics at higher levels did not perdure through the fourth century as part of the ordinary educational curriculum, for when one had to educate

a whole class to citizenship and imperial responsibility, literary tools were the commonly adaptable instruments; esoteric and specialized subjects were considered useless. Witness the striving of physicians like Galen to identify with the general culture of his time and resist the ossification of specialization. The sensitive mind won out over the geometric mind; Isocrates over Plato; Homer, over Euclid.[10]

When we note the values incorporated in the Graeco-Roman system, modern critics of such a system seem somewhat insensitive when they place such a high value on originality and decry the imitation of Greek models which it used so widely. For, if we can accept as valid the desire of the Roman state to spread order, justice, and peace so that men could spend their lives in happiness, the world had to be organized in such a way that these values (those of Hellenistic civilization) could be broadcast. This great work was Rome's historic function; her glory was to ensure for future renaissances the cultural heritage of the greatest intellectual periods men had ever known. Her tool was paideia-humanitias. Its content was literature; its morphosis rhetorical formation.

But Rome added its own inimitable flavor to that formation. Her strongly moral, home-spun historical roots, the strength of her peasantry close to the soil, and her inculcation and respect for the Roman virtues: sobrietas, gravitas, pietas, veneration of the mos maiorum -- all these were never really lost in theory, if, in practice. The models of the young were heroes

of the state and their own families: the Cornelii, Claudii, Gracchi; these were the models alive in the minds of young men and women in the schools: Roman models, mythological or not, came from the national history, the glories of moral stature, especially, that of sacrificial service to the civitas, a far-cry from the individualism of later Greek culture. The role of the family and its heroes and history was so influential that men felt themselves to be re-living the values of their ancestors, e.g. Cato and Brutus.

Only with Greek culture did new ideas creep in, and the assimilative power of the Romans began to operate. Marrou feels that "in education the distinctive contribution made by Roman sensibility, the Roman character and the Roman tradition only appear as slight alterations of detail, or as trends that sometimes tended to favor and so sometimes tended to inhibit certain aspects of the Greek attitude towards education."[11] When Rome realized her need for communication as ruler of the Mediterranean, rhetoric won the day, for rhetoric was education, and the polyglot culture of the Empire called for administrators, diplomats, generals, bureaucrats who could communicate, ensure peace and order, preserve the tradition: in short, could live their heritage and pass it on. Such roles also called for an education which would ensure legal expertise, a distinctively Roman contribution to humanitas, preserving both the respect for the archaic and the desire for peace and order in its system of observing precedents, procedures, customs, citing the law,

XUM

but it also drew on the intellectual achievement of Greek thought in Aristotelian logic and Stoic moral science.

The question our age still tends to ask, however impressive the Roman educational achievement and its transmission of culture, is why this system was still so hardy and so much a status-symbol by the fourth century as the barbarian pounded the news of the demise of classicism upon the gates of Rome. It was just this threat which actually heightened the value of the tradition in the eyes of pagans all over the Empire. And such cherishing was not confined to the Roman aristocracy: we find it in Gaul in the time of Eugenius, and of Sidonius Apollinaris; in Antioch, in the pupils of Libanius. Valentinian I will invite Ausonius to tutor his son, and in spite of criticism by Roman aristocrats, he comes off rather well in the eyes of a modern critic.[12] But all these men, Roman or provincial, will see the classical literary tradition as their culture, the last bastion against the barbarian infiltration. Another vital reason: this culture seemed to educated pagans to be the last defense against the Christian infiltration. The prestige of classical Romanitas in the Later Empire had little to do with the worth of a rich intellectual content; rather, it derived from preservation of form, and from a revived archaism, a fear of change: cultural, religious, or social, and from its extreme usefulness as a means to ascend the ladder to imperial favour and position.[13]

And here we come full circle to the values that age held

dear. Cicero and Quintilian had stated it clearly long before the fourth century: rhetoric as humanitas, as the direct instrument of Romanitas, could make a man good as well as learned. It could mould him. It could make him one who thought good thoughts and did good deeds as well as one who expressed them well in speech and writing. Late imperial education was entirely traditional; it still prized intellectual clarity: ability to speak clearly and to express nobly, but its aim was always basically formation of character as well as mind.

When Symmachus called for the restoration of the statue of Victory to the Curia, it was not a gesture of religious concern alone; the connection between patriotism and religion was strong and binding. An insult to the gods was also one to the ethos of Romanitas and to the cult of Roman power and identity: Horace warned: "Only as a servant of the gods in heaven can you rule the earth. The seed of action is theirs and the fruit. Slighted, have they not given suffering Italy multiple miseries?"[14] Romanitas held in richly blended suspension religion and culture; palatable, de rigeur, the bouquet of the civilization which Rome had served the Empire.

Now, let us see what the Christian Church did in such a milieu to inculcate its own belief. Was there a Christian paideia? In its infancy in the first century A.D., it made no rival claims in the cultural sphere. It was a religion, a "way," and, thereby, according to the thinking of the age, it could purport to be a philosophy as well. But for a long

time, it had no such intellectual pretensions, for to the Christian, education meant dogma and moral training given especially in the home, the inculcation of a way to think and live and love, so in it, they felt, philosophy and theology were one in theory and truth.

You will recall Cumont's remark concerning the resemblances between Christian and pagan by the time of Symmachus: both kinds of believers moved in the same intellectual and moral sphere; one could actually pass from one to the other without shock. He attributed this harmony to the triumph of the "religious and mystical spirit of the Orient" permeating the social organism, preparing it for unity in the bosom of the Church universal.[15] But the religious and mystical spirit of the Orient was inextricably combined by that time with Greek culture, the blend was Hellenistic. Greek language and culture predominated in the Mediterranean world in which Christianity disseminated its message. Droysen has insisted in his epoch-making work that the origins, the direction, and the remarkable development of Christianity all took place in a Hellenistic milieu.[16]

For our approach to Augustine's attitude toward the values of Romanitas, we here arrive at a crucial period, for what happened in the birth and infancy of Christianity is what Marrou calls "cultural osmosis" a transfusion and transmission of values. This is the period of the Apostles, the Apostolic Fathers, and the Apologists, culminating in Origen and Clement

XUM

of Alexandria.[17]

The pagan cultural ideal of paideia-humanitas was the formation of the whole man, man as an unconditioned source of value. Scripture told the new Christian plainly that man was good, and so had the light of the intellectual world of the time, Plato, as revived by Neoplatonism. Furthermore, the task of instruction belonged to the family and the Church; no need for separate schools, except in times of nonavailability of such resources. Christianity, which depended more and more on its sacred writings, needed paideia to provide readers and believers who would, in turn, be sources of light and information for their pagan neighbors. Again, in general, converts were adult pagans who had already assimilated parts of the normal curriculum of the Graeco-Roman world.

Christian instruction was given in the home, the Christian assembly and the catechetical school by the didaskaloi. It supplemented classical paideia and its culture, but it is important to note that this use of the system of pagan culture did not imply a total acceptance of values. Far from it. For paideia claimed what Christianity claimed as rival: ultimate answers to the great questions. Yet, she alone claimed to present true answers to man's search for happiness, truth, love, and goodness in Christ as Logos, and in the Christian's relationship with the Trinity. We cannot treat here the long history of positive and negative positions toward pagan paideia (often by the same writer) during the patristic period on this subject.[18]

Our concern is values accepted or rejected by the Christian system of paideia as fed by and feeding into the Hellenistic civilization in which it grew.

Pauline thinking on this subject is found in Ephesians (6.1-4) specifically quoted in the Apostolic Constitutions (4.11) along with numerous references to the Old Testament:[19] "Teach your children the word of the Lord, straighten them even with stripes and render them submissive, teaching them from infancy the Holy Scripture...not permitting them to exercise authority over you, nor allowing them to foregather for carousal with their equals in age; for in that way they will be diverted into disorder and fall into fornication."[20] An interesting combination here of the values: literary (Scriptural), dogmatic, and moral aspects of Christian formation.

Justin Martyr (d.c.165A.D.) a convert from philosophy exemplifies the apologetic approach to thinking out the message later to become a true theology. Convinced that in Christ, the Logos, he had finally come to truth, he made free use of current Stoic, Pythagorean, and Platonic ideas to ridicule the gods and to counter the opposition the Christians were facing from pagan culture. His methodology is a datum of Christian education for the period. Justin was in the line of philosophic missionaries trying to convert their contemporaries.[21] The apologists promised men knowledge of a higher type, presented Christ as Teacher and way to happi-

XUM

ness, peace, and love. Theirs was a protreptic activity characteristic of the philosophical schools of the time. Significantly, they first addressed themselves to Hellenized Jews in general, but very soon they had to take account of the values of educated Greek and Roman audiences: the Hellenistic culture alive in men's lives, an encounter dramatically seen in Paul's speech on the Areopagus (Act 17.17). Historical or not, it is the prologue to the confrontation of pagan and Christian paideias, one which had to utilize a common basis of communication: the Greek philosophical tradition, the most representative part of that which was alive in Greek culture at the time.[22]

One can hardly overlook an additional educational tool: that of the homily, the sermon, episcopal instructions, and catechetical treatises. For example, Clement's Letter to the Corinthians with its praise of peace and order finds an echo in Euripides Phoinissai in Jocasta's arguments to Eteocles. Clement also invokes Peter and Paul as models of obedience; he shifts from the Christian emphasis on faith to a stronger voice for good works, and Christian teaching moves pedagogically toward values of ethical idealism as found in the Pastoral Epistles. Clement uses Stoic moralism and Greek political theory, social ethics and cosmological philosophy, thus appealing directly to the paideia of educated Corinthians who will identify with the concepts of physis, (nature), the divine laws of the universe we saw as so germinal in pagan

Greek paideia above, of synkrasis (blend) the ideal of political unity, and sympnoia (breathing together), the ideal of spiritual unity in the Church.[23]

If, as Jurgens insists,[24] this Letter is closer to 80 than its usually assigned 96 A.D., it is an even more telling sign of how soon Christianity made free use of Greek paideia and its values to speak to its own converts while learning how to speak from them. The very synkrasis Clement pleaded for he used in his literary and pedagogical practice: an awareness of the mode of reception of his hearers: their culture, their paideia. In the best tradition of Scripture itself, he gave milk to babes to prepare them for the meat of the Word Himself. His letter is an act of Christian paideia, the "paideia of God," exactly the phrase Clement uses. "We were, moreover, all the more delighted to remind you of these things, since we were writing to people...who had made a study of the oracles of God's teaching."[25]

Jaeger sees Clement's Letter, along with Ephesians, Hebrews, and II Timothy as the evolution of a new concept of Christian paideia. That process presupposes paideia as the common educational tool of the culture known to all; it is the vehicle of the Word for bearers of the Book. Jaeger says it well: "History does not proceed by starting with a definition of what it takes over from the past, but by taking possession of it and adapting it to its new purposes."[26] Christianity assessed the values inherent in Hellenistic paideia, then used and assimilated what

XUM

was useful, what communicated, and discarded the dross. Teaching by biblical authority and argument from reason, from philosophy, had begun; synkrasis, the blend, will be Christian paideia as the finest fruit of the theological venture of Clement of Alexandria and Origen to whom we now turn.

The exigencies of the time, meanwhile, as ever, worked relentlessly in their influence upon the life of the Christian community in the third century world of Clement and Origen. Two of these in particular, had to be recognized, encountered and used or discarded in the educational effort of the Church: persecution and heresy. The former had claimed the life of Origen's Father, Leonides, and the Decian persecution finally caused his own death. But it was the heretical writings of the Gnostics which were an immediate influence and stimulus. The Alexandrian Church came into close contact with Greek paideia in the work of Philo Judaeus who used Greek philosophy to speak to the Jews. The Christian philosophers had to use the same medium to speak to the same culture.

Clement of Alexandria saw Christianity as the true philosophy: its concerns were ethics, cosmology, and especially theology. In the environment of Alexandria constant exchange took place between Christian, Greek, and Jew; Ammonius Saccas taught Origen, Plotinus, and Longinus, and Origen attended his lectures in order to learn what pagans thought. This intellectual climate of inquiry characteristic of Hellenism was necessary for the adaptation and assimilation Christian

teachers needed to function and speak to their own culture.

Philosophy was the medium of such speech as the highest form of Greek paideia, but philosophy also, meant, of course, what we would call theology. Greek philosophy and Christian theology came together in the person of Origen, as teacher in the catechetical school, as philosopher, and theologian. Christianity had arrived at the point where it met the universal system of culture, paideia. It claimed to be the universal religion of the Logos of Christ as God. And it arrived in time to participate in the evolution of Greek thought in Hellenistic form: at that moment philosophy was actually performing the role of a religion as we have seen above: guiding men as how to live according to a set of dogmas or truths. No wonder the Greek could call Jewish or Christian belief "philosophy." However, theoretical philosophy, wounded by Skepticism, was in decline; few could handle it technically; most philosophy was moral teaching and religious and theological discussion. Plato became the salvation of such a system in the synthesis achieved by Middle and Neoplatonism. Because of his concentration on the human soul, he became the guide of those who sought ultimate answers: the good, true, and the beautiful; his eternal Ideas became the Ideas of God.

Plato had also taught that knowledge was virtue, and by that he meant that man had to know how to tell the good from appearances, the true from the false. Philosophy was the

highest form of *paideia* to Plato; the education of man, man's noblest occupation, for man thereby imitated God who is Himself the Pedagogue of the universe (*Laws* X.897b). Origen, inspired by this Platonic idea, built upon Clement's view of Christ as divine educator in his *Paedagogus*, the very title of which juxtaposes Christ and Greek *paideia*, "an ideal of human existence to which every educated man and woman and every civilized nation has aspired since Plato."[27]

But this implied both a program and a startling claim for Christianity and the conflict began. The Church aspired to replace the *paideia* of the Hellenistic world, for by now *paideia* meant culture as a whole. And the new teacher would be faith. Clement and Origen, then, in making such claims, had also, to adjust. They were struggling with the problem of unifying a culture, and this led them to see the pagan philosophers' piece of truth as indicative of their guidance by divine aid. From this point, they advanced to see philosophy as *propaideia* to the divine *paideia* they now proclaimed: Christianity itself (*Stromata* 1.19).

Jaeger shows how Christ is, for Origen, the educator who transforms sublime ideals such as those of Plato into reality, while prophets and philosophers have proceeded him. Origen finds the evidence of this Logos and of Providence in the history of the Greek mind. *Paideia* is thus the gradual fulfillment of the Divine Providence.[28]

Such a viewpoint was nourished by the Hellenistic concept

of paideia and the riches of the best education philosophy could afford. Origen himself taught in a classical school, but soon was made head of the catechetical school by his bishop (Eus. H.E. 6.3.8). Eusebius goes on to show how Origen cleverly adapted methods from Hellenistic higher studies to his religious classes leading to philosophy and biblical theology, and of the establishment of a connecting link between Origen and the Cappadocians through Gregory Thaumaturgus. But Origen's example of higher schools was not followed; religious education remained a private thing, continuing the process of using and discarding the local cultural educational values.

Let us now turn to the fourth century, a new milieu for Christianity, indeed, for the posture of defense was over with Constantine. Yet, it was only under Theodosius that Christianity finally became the official religion of the Empire. Origen had seen Christianity as the fulfillment of the best in philosophical tradition. But the fourth century demanded more and found it in the Greek Fathers and in Augustine.

The Cappadocians were men of wide culture who envisioned Christianity as the integrating, unifying factor of a whole civilization. But, first, they had to handle the problem of the educated classes whose religion was paideia, and paideia was also the social foundation of their civilization. Why abandon it for a new superstition? Varro had taken this defensive position in his Antiquitates, not because he had staunch faith in the gods, but because the practice of Roman religion

XUM

was a part of the mos maiorum, part of his heritage and his Romanitas. That culture had unified the world, reasoned Symmachus, why discard the glory of Romanitas?

The Christian leadership rose to the challenge and produced Christian paideia through the intelligent use of the riches of the pagan philosophical schools applied through the art of rhetoric in sermons, instructions, and theological works of men like Basil and the two Gregorys. Gregory Nazianzen created a Christian literature using Greek literary forms transformed by the Christian spirit and met the challenge of the comparable literature of the pagans of the time. Gregory of Nyssa and Basil freely used Greek tradition to the full in their philosophical writings, and Basil's Letter to Young Men will praise the form, but reject the content of ancient poetry. The work of these three Jaeger sees as a renaissance and a miracle, comparable to that of North Africa in the West from Tertullian to Augustine. He shows that the Greek and Latin mind was the instrument of their communication, but Greek tradition was their ultimate cultural link, preserving "certain basic tendencies of the classical mind around which the ideas of their own age could crystallize...the Hellenistic element constitutes its intellectual medium and determines its dialectical rhythm, a great historical rhythm that will always remain one of the reasons for our inexhaustible interest in the subject."[29]

The fourth century, however, witnessed the Emperor Julian edict's depriving Christian professors of the right to teach,

and brought up the question our age continues to ask about distinct schools for Christians. Yet we never find separate facilities in any number outside monastic and episcopal establishments which were hardly well organized until the sixth century. Great bishops like Chrysostom in Constantinople, Ambrose in Milan and Augustine in Africa were magnificent teachers and preachers, converting and instructing many, but we find no trace of a separate Christian establishment for education outside the catechumenate. These men were products of the pagan system themselves, they partook of the characteristic features of the Romanitas of their time in its literary culture: conformity to type, conservatism, tendency to imitation, admiration for the archaic models, -- all of which led often to slavish copying, absence of content, and sterility.

St. Ambrose is a fine example of the Christian bishop busy with his flock, a statesman and teacher, but a man who never loses contact with his cultural roots. Ambrose knew his Vergil, the outstanding model of fourth century Latinists; he quotes him directly and indirectly hundreds of times.[30] De Labriolle cites Ambrose for another characteristic of Late Imperial style: he will use the <u>suasoria</u> and the <u>controversia</u>, standard rhetorical forms to make his point in a sermon or a letter.[31] The form, then, of the literary works of Christian writers corresponds to that of their pagan contemporaries. They display the characteristics <u>supra</u>, limiting themselves only when dogmatic or moral considerations will so demand. A religious spirit

permeates their desire to convey the truth of their faith; their goal is the proclamation of the Word. Content returns to literature in the fourth-century Christian writers of the quality of the Cappadocians and Augustine.

Again, we must recall that the literary output of this age was large, but, in general, undistinguished, and it had achieved a remarkable uniformity. The Roman Imperial system had done its work of Hellenization of Romanitas; there was no truly regional school of literature. Cappadocia, Egypt, Africa, Gaul; the locale made little difference in literary forms; the paideia-humanitas was the same; the models, alike: Homer, Plato, Demosthenes, Vergil, Cicero, Horace, Sallust. How could the teaching Church give up such a tool of communication to re-enter a cultural enclave from which it had emerged in the work of Origen, Clement, the Cappadocians? Cultural fusion was now almost complete in the East through their work. It would appear in the Western Church through Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, and their followers. Augustine we will treat separately infra, but Ambrose is again an excellent example of this fusion and the Church's use of humanitas for its own ends. He represents not only the synkrasis of pagan culture and paideia with Christian ministry, catechetics, and preaching, but also the blend of Eastern and Western Christianity, for he turned to the Eastern Fathers as his theologians in his need to learn what it was to be a Christian bishop. For exegesis, he read Philo and Origen. For moral and dogma, Athanasius,

XUM

Basil, Cyril of Jerusalem, Didymus, Epiphanius, and Gregory Nazianzen, eagerly obtaining their works as quickly as they appeared.

Yet, Ambrose will make full use of Cicero in his own De officiis (386 A.D.), copying the original closely, but in how different a spirit! He decries the false basis of pagan philosophy, even while borrowing from Stoic morality ideas such as the summum bonum, the treatment of duties, the classification of the virtues, the great value of the judgment of conscience. Suddenly we meet the Christian value system juxtaposed once and for all to the pagan: humilitas, modestia, verecundia, and even pietas, but now with a Christian translation.[32] Christianity faced the great questions of the time: man's source, his destiny, and his meaning. Answers came then from the fundamental doctrines: Pronoia as truly Providence; faith in Christ, hope of immortality and life after death are clearly proclaimed.

The new faith provided a living content for pagan literary form. Origen's dream came true by the end of the fourth century, and only because the Church had the wisdom to spoil the Egyptians while preserving and teaching her own values. Her theology used the vehicle of the cultural system of the time, its educational mould, and so spoke to and convinced the Hellenistic educated classes.

Nowhere was this better exemplified than in Jerome who gave Christianity the text of the Word, commentaries on it

using Origen, the De viris illustribus, our first history of Graeco-Latin Christian literature, letters, and polemics, all in the high tradition of classical erudition. Another such instance of Christian-pagan fusion appears in St. John Chrysostom who followed the literary training of his pagan master Libanius and used Plato and Demosthenes for his models. He presented his own system of Christian paideia in his Address on Vainglory and the Right Way for Parents to Bring up Their Children.[33] Significantly, he expresses sentiments found in Plutarch and Quintilian on the same subject, another indication of the homogeneity of classical education in Hellenistic civilization.

A final instance of the fusion of pagan and Christian paideia appears in Christian works which use pagan models, but either disguise them cleverly, or for which no comparison is possible since we no longer possess them. Porphyry's Kata Christianon condemned to be burnt under Constantine and again under Theodosius is such. Porphyry's influence continued to affect both Eastern and Western Fathers through the century. Laistner notes the influence of Neoplatonism on Basil and Ambrose who had actually read Plotinus himself.[34]

This flow of communication between East and West was possible, of course, only because of the koine: classical education, but this flow was indicative of something else: a new attitude of the East toward the West under the influence of Christianity which strove to find and use anything which

would benefit men's souls or clarify doctrine. Translation received in the fourth century a wide extension for this reason and was free from many of the prejudices of the pre-Christian era: "Thus we find a powerful development in the exchange of ideas between East and West, a double current, stronger certainly from the East to the West but manifest also in the other direction..."[35] What took place was a great effort in the fourth century to preserve the Roman literary heritage on the part of the cultured classes. Christianity, by supplying a vital content to the total literary output, both benefited by it as vehicle for communication for the dissemination its doctrine, and added to the richness and longevity of its own life.

Certainly, Augustine is most prominent in the Western phase of the development of fourth century humanitas as one formed by it and one of its formers. However, his relationship to his cultural and educational shaping we will treat below when we study this relationship as part of his general attitude toward Romanitas.

A final section of our approach to the educational form and content of fourth century paideia-humanitas calls for a closer look at the achievement of the Eastern Fathers, for the fourth century encompassed in its channel two great streams of religious ideas, values, concepts of man, world-views: the pagan and the Christian. In spite of the summary treatment given the Christian literary product of this period

by standard approaches to Graeco-Roman Literature, we cannot underestimate the influence of the works of the Eastern Fathers in its impact upon the Western and Christian stream through translation. As Americans we depend in many fields of intellectual endeavor upon the products of translation. It would appear that we might understand, then, both the impact of translation literature and its wide circulation in the Later Empire. Ambrose, Hilary, and Augustine are a case in point.

The fact that the Christian enterprise produced no separate schools and that they continued to use the classical Hellenistic system for the education of Christians does not necessarily imply an absence of Christian cultural growth, nor an absence of impact of Christian values upon the pagan culture. Mutual appropriation was the order of the day, as seen in the Gnostics, the philosophers, and the Christian catechist, theologian, and bishop. Translation made it possible in the West.

One of those bishops whose phenomenal activity widely influenced this appropriation is Gregory of Nyssa. I speak of him, in particular, as a fine example of the wedding of Hellenistic culture and Christianity. Himself a bishop, Gregory died when Augustine was almost a bishop (394), an original speculative theologian and philosopher, a mystic, a monk, the greatest of the orthodox continuators of Origen's thought, and the forerunner of Denys the Areopagite.[36] Along with Basil (330-379) and Gregory of Nazianzus (330-390) he helped develop a mystical

XUM

theology which quickened the heartbeat of a whole civilization so great was the influence of their thought, their sanctity, and their lives in their own culture, rapidly becoming the Byzantine civilization of the Late Eastern Empire. "The mystical reform ideas of the Greek and Eastern Fathers--centered around the key concepts of the return to Paradise, of divine resemblance and assimilation, and of the Kingdom of God--were to become forces which moulded the sacral culture of the Byzantine world...not lacking in western thought; yet other and different aspects of the idea of reform were to gain greater importance in the west.[37]

For the Greek Fathers the mystical recovery of the lost resemblance to God, especially as Gregory of Nyssa conceived it, was certainly reform, the changing of the pagan world in which they lived, of the half-Christian imperial rulers, bureaucracy, clergy, and people of God. Such reform, for them, as we have seen was truly deification, as Basil put it: "to akrotaton ton horekton: Theon genesthai."[38]

This spirituality will highly affect the tone of the civilization which was emerging in the Eastern Later Empire, the Empire of the Basileus-Autokrator. What was the relationship between the Kingdom of God which was in the heart of the Christian man and that Empire? Could they be one, and how could that come about? These questions will echo in Augustine's Western milieu. In the Contra Celsum, Origen had actually identified the Church with the Kingdom.[39] He implied that the

Christian Empire Celsus feared would imitate Christ's rule over the world; the terrestrial Basileia would be potentially identical with the heavenly one or similar to it...these questions were answered in the affirmative after the Christianization of the Empire by Origen's spiritual descendent, Eusebius, and a whole tribe of likeminded Christian "imperialists."[40]

Eusebius's concept of Emperor as imitator of Christ, ruling for the Logos, was the standard basis for "political theology" in the Christian East, and a close relationship emerged throughout Byzantine history between the political and ecclesiastical orders of Christian life, for the ascetic, the mystic, and the ruler shared between them the true kingship, representing two different but equally high orders of men. Monks, rather than secular priests, came to be considered the spiritual rulers of the Christian conscience, and emperors took a quasisacerdotal position in the Church.[41]

Only John Chrysostom opposed the basileia theology, and insisted upon applying biblical counsels of perfection to the laymen who were his parishioners as well as to the monk and priest. This thinking we saw reflected in his discourse to parents above: God's representative on this earth is not the emperor, but the child's father. John's work proved of no avail, he had tried to reform the polis within the basileia; the East remained monastic and imperial. It remained for Augustine to pick up this educational ideal and put the civitas-polis idea on another plane outside the political sphere of the

Empire. He would pursue his goal through what Ladner calls a "monastization" of his clergy, a practical realization of his reform ideology of great significance for the future of the Christian West.[42]

But it was not John Chrysostom, but Gregory of Nyssa who best exemplified the world-view, the concept of man, and the values characterizing Hellenistic paideia which came to Ambrose in Milan and, through translation, to Christian thinkers in the West. I feel that Gregory's idea of Christian paideia is very important for the flow of ideas westward we have considered above. His thought, along with that of his brother, Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus, and John Chrysostom was rediscovered by the Renaissance. Jaeger, in this connection, points out two still unresolved problems: the influence of the works of the Greek Fathers on the Renaissance, although the number of manuscripts of their works in the library collection surpasses those of the classical authors, and secondly, the still unexplained way in which Augustine shares so many characteristic features with the Cappadocians.[43] This latter problem seems to me part of the picture I have been presenting above. We will speak to some factors which might throw light on a solution when we treat of Augustine below.

Gregory of Nyssa, like Augustine, saw Christianity as the perfect education. He, too, was intensely interested in the monastic aspects of the life of assimilation to God in which the soul recovered its lost resemblance to Him. But the impulse

to this purification and assimilation comes from God Himself who also helps the *praxis* to fulfill the impulse in the Christian's life. For Gregory, in the process of assimilation, the object of the aspiration, the vision (*theoria*) of God is one and the same as the desire for Him.[44] The attainment and the pursuit are the same activity; the desire for God is never fulfilled, so, man's happiness on earth is to seek God in ever higher desiring. Ladner calls this the Christian and at the same time Greek resolution of the antinomies of rest and motion, of like and unlike, of unity and multiplicity, of being and becoming, of eternity and change.[45] So the Kingdom of God was in man--and yet it will come--at the end of the world.

This ambiguity of the immanence and transcendence, of Presence and Kingdom, ever present in Christianity, gave rise in the East to the concept of the Christian empire we noted above; the emperor was *ipso facto* minister of God on earth. In the West the biblical idea of the heavenly Jerusalem, the *Polis* of God, was a more important influence and led to Augustine's *Civitas*-theology.

Given this milieu and this theology, Gregory could only see education, *paideia*, as the formative process of human personality. As the Christian sought God in his humane studies: the Hellenistic liberal arts and Greek philosophy, Gregory saw him involved in this process of *morphosis*. But it was not just the teaching of Christian belief that was added to this *paideia* of the pagan world. Gregory envisioned a development

XUM

of the human spirit which could rival and complement the best of Greek philosophical education. And it is imperative to recall that by the fourth century, rhetoric, i.e., literature, had gradually encroached upon this solitary preserve of philosophy; it was paideia. Gregory felt that the coming of Christ, the Pedagogue of Mankind, meant that the ancient striving for complete paideia could be fulfilled, for now arete was possible to man through training, endowment, and, above all, through grace, the point of entry for the Christian complement to Greek educational theory and praxis. Grace, he felt, was the cooperation of the Spirit with man, and here his concept of synergy is truly Greek, for he felt that man received even more divine aid as man strove harder to cooperate.

Here Gregory chose a concept of man truly Platonic; man was good; evil was ignorance, God made all that is, good, and apocatastasis was the logical result of such a position: paideia ends in restoration of the pristine condition of creation. The goal of the Christian life was assimilation to God; this life, the struggle to attain it. Monasticism seemed the perfect answer to the need for a climate of struggle and ascent. Christianity was indeed a bios, and a via; it was the philosophic life, the true fulfillment of all the striving of the Greek philosophers.

But by now, Homer was paideia; literature was the actual Content of education; philosophy was kept for the highest level, but for the Christian, it now became propaedeutic to

the new content of paideia: the new literature, The Book, the Bible. And literature was education so the study of the Bible was not just the study of its literary forms. Man was shaped by the morphosis of his study of the Scriptures.

Gregory constantly refers to the educational activity of the Bible, for the Bible is inspired by the Holy Spirit who is the pedagogical authority of its Word which is graduated in meaning to adapt to the various degrees of understanding of the Christians who read it. Gregory not only follows Origen here as to exegesis, but more importantly, he stresses the pedagogical action of the Spirit in general, in the totality of Scriptura and Historia as well. He follows in the path of Romans (8), where Paul stresses the Spirit as necessary for the man who tries to pray: only the Spirit can understand the Spirit; the Christian needs the light and help of the Spirit to read the Word of Himself, the Spirit. Jaeger insists upon the very real dimension of the belief of men like Gregory in the Spirit's activity and aid in their lives and their writings, and not only in their reading of the Scripture.[47]

However, Gregory saw Scripture as a complete Christian paideia: the Spirit spoke through the historical books, epistles, gospels, but, especially, through the Psalms which he treats as a five-part ladder to spiritual heights: Gregory's theory of the grades of mystical progress, of theognosia.[48] This was also Gregory's real meaning of reform on earth: the return to a spiritual Paradise in the soul and recovery of the

likeness to God, the work of the paideia of the Holy Spirit through the Scripture and his grace-activity in the Christian man: this is the metamorphosis of Romans (12.2).

Greek civilization in its Hellenistic form had come full circle. In Gregory, the Greek forms are the framework for the Christian content. Plato's "assimilation to God" stands next to the Christian idea of image and likeness of God and is absorbed into it.[49] Its most perfect embodiment Gregory urged upon monastic life in his own Cappadocia and the Pontus. Laid over the substructure of the monastic attempts of Antony and his hermits, his ideas of Greek paideia in their Platonic form entered the life of Christian culture and gave impetus to ascetic forms whose influence spread ultimately to the West as well: Basil, Gregory's brother and his greatest teacher, through his writings, taught Ambrose, and Ambrose, Augustine.

The possibilities of inter-influence are fascinating and invite exploration, but when we return to the West after this stay in Cappadocia, we will find Augustine encountering a fourth-century paideia which had only begun to assimilate Christian concepts as interpreted by Emperors like Constantine and Theodosius through imperial decrees. The culture, in general, knew only too well the influence of Christianity upon pagan religious customs, social activity, imperial service, but its paideia was pagan and remained so, for it was the tool of Romanitas, of culture. Christianity was primarily, even in the Late Empire, still a religion. It made good use of paideia,

but, in the West, it would be centuries before Gregory's dream of Christian paideia would be realized in the High Middle Ages.

However, as the fourth century eased into the fifth, given the ideas of a Gregory of Nyssa and the impact upon court and civitas of bishops like Augustine and Ambrose, Christianity could no longer hide from the responsibility of being what it was becoming, also a culture, and that reality presented a challenge not only to Christians but also to the pagan educated classes of the Empire. Here we are chiefly interested in the Western milieu in which Augustine's ideas and personality had such impact; the pagan-Christian milieu of Rome, of Milan, Carthage, and Hippo. And in that milieu the common denominator of those who thought and read and searched -- and wrote to Augustine for answers -- was their classical education, paideia-humanitas.

But this very education held pagans back from capitulating to the new faith, for they met it in living men, and, then as now, Christianity presented different faces of accepted beliefs according to whether they were presented by a Pelagius or an Augustine. The former would have presented Catholicism as an "austere perfectionism, the sole law of the Christian community,"[50] while the latter appears as the great exponent of moral tolerance inside the Church. At the turn of the century, it was Augustine's approach which would finally lead to the transposition, assimilation, and the final victory of the Christian religion among the Roman aristocrats.

Education and its glorification of classical civilization were the status symbols of these aristocrats, while Christianity had taught and continued to teach that the old gods were demons, that pagan literary works were those of the devil. Yet, Christians in general, would not think of depriving their sons of the only road to advancement: Graeco-Roman education. The reconciliation of these opposing forces might be laid at the door of the man who created the official dichotomy in the first place: Constantine. Diocletian had minimized the role of the Senate in his reorganization of the state, while he made the equestrians his administrators. Constantine, however, returned the senators to high administrative posts, making them his comites, and greatly expanded their number so that, by mid-century, the senatorial class had swallowed up the knights; they were the official aristocracy of the Empire once again, even though their ranks now included Romans, wealthy provincials, army officers, barbarians, and even former peasants. This composition of the senate had much to do with the religious struggle and the cultural as well. Many of the middle and lower class members had not had a classical education; they felt no wrench in renouncing their gods and accepting the faith of the ruling Emperor, especially, in the Eastern Empire. But in the West, the scions of ancient houses were pagan, on the whole, down into the fifth century. However, we do not know how pagan the entire senatorial order was, though we can see indications in the controversy over the removal of the

Altar of Victory from the Senate, and Ambrose had to take strong measures to influence the final decision for the Christian side.

On the other hand, as Jones insists, Constantine and his successors had available to them the new nobility of service, the bureaucracy of Diocletian which they inherited and which was bound to them in sympathy with their persons and policies. Their favorable attitude to Christianity helped shift the balance of many neutral persons and these not necessarily hypocritical. But even more important: the social flux of the time helped make Christianity finally respectable: a religio licita, it was even fashionable, and Christians in high places helped lesser folk to follow their example. Soon it was the religion of the Empire. And religious change coincided with social change which allowed such support from the Emperor to have a double impact upon society.[51]

At this juncture, Peter Brown's approach to the Christianization of the Roman aristocrats neatly balances the above view. He plays down emphasis upon the role of the Emperor's use of authority as explanation of the religious transformation, and attributes that change "not to a brutal rejection of the past by an authoritarian regime, but to a transformation in which much of the Roman secular tradition was preserved."[52] This is the point I wish to emphasize: the use of classical education as the coin of exchange between the two religions and the old and the emerging cultures. Given what Romanitas

and its religion and culture meant to the aristocrat, he would hardly accept Christianity as part of his intellectual and emotional equipment merely at the bidding of a Constantine! The approach to a solution Brown adopts depends upon examining the human factors of the pagan culture of the Roman aristocrats: marriages, education, friends, in short, the approach which Augustine took at that very period to the very aristocrats we question as to their motivations for change. This approach I find very satisfying since it is the avenue I also wish to traverse in studying Augustine's attitude toward Romanitas.

Brown's use of this social, analytical approach helps him set in perspective other theories for pagan aristocratic conversions, but leaves him with the solid basis of a common denominator, a bridge for the approach of Christian and pagan toward a meeting of minds. This bridge is, of course, the common ground of the classical culture of the age produced by the common education we have studied above. What was seen alternately as obstacle, danger, problem became eventually the way and the language to meet the pagan on his own terms. Brown calls this gradual movement and assimilation "a drift into a respectable Christianity...which explains how a Christianized Roman aristocracy was able to maintain, in Italy, up to the end of the sixth century, the secular traditions of the City of Rome. . . due to the slow transformation of whole families which led to a blurring of the sharp division between a pagan past and a Christian present."[53]

This approach, much like that of the prosopographical work of Sir Ronald Syme,[54] avoids the pitfalls of the somewhat simplistic "conflict of authority" thesis which explains conversions by simple imposition of the emperor's will. There is a continuity of Roman senatorial power and prestige after the Frigidus and the suicide of Flavianus in 394 A.D., a continuity inexplicable, given the conflict of authority theory. I see this as merely another instance of the tendency to apply current cultural backgrounds and modern thought-forms to an ancient milieu which will not tolerate such application. Americans, in particular, given our common rootlessness of a sort, have great difficulty in realizing the honor and prestige attached to the senatorial order in spite of its vicissitudes with various imperial rulers whom they regarded, in general, as figureheads and upstarts compared to the families of the republican past. But what astonishes us more is that this view was not exclusively theirs (and the significance of the educational system appears in all its might at this point of interpretation); it was shared by emperor, soldier, and peasant as a datum of their relationship to the glory that was Romanitas, a cultural superiority, hard-earned, capsulated in the cult of Vergil and Cicero, a sine qua non for civilized interchange in any part of the imperial world. Alfoldi explains why:

> There was a reason for the wide importance of the ideals that the Senate represented. The curia was commonly regarded as the true guardian of the canonical ethical tradition of the ancients, and so the conception that it entertained of national morality

> was in many respects binding on those persons and grades of society that counted in politics. The rhetorical culture, then completely dominant, steadily held up the ideal of a Fabricius, a Cincinnatus, a Cato as a model for men of breeding to follow, and history, dependent on rhetoric, applied the same measure to the statesmen of the past and held them up as a mirror for the present to copy.[55]
>
> (underscorings mine)

To be true princeps, a first among his peers, an emperor must be aware of these traditional sensibilities, dutifully observant of the mos maiorum; above all, he would translate that pietas into his treatment of the Senate, the representatives of Republican libertas. Emperors would face the reality of the changing composition of their subject peoples, and extend the citizenship to all inhabitants of the Empire (212 A.D.), but, in general, they avoided treading upon the sensitive incarnation of Romanitas: the senatorial order, especially, upon its aristocratic families.

And, in general, the burgeoning Christian Church, a child of the same culture, understood and used for its evangelical purpose this tradition of respect, yet it had to balance this understanding with its mission to witness to the true Logos, Christ, and his judgment upon all societies, Roman or otherwise -- a task which it is still trying to accomplish. And why not, when this is the condition of being in the world but not of it?

Augustine well exemplifies both of these tendencies in his treatment of the very aristocrats we are here studying: the fourth and fifth century families who for a hundred years

had been experiencing the infiltration of Christianity into their hearths, this gradual replacement of the Penates and Lares by the Christian God embraced by their womenfolk, for it was the latter who were the first Christians in the great families: the Anicii, Valerii, and Caeionii. The male members of these houses seemed to remain solid in their paganism and secular traditions. They will have mothers, sisters, wives, nieces who are Christian, and out of that context they will challenge Ambrose and Augustine to answer their perplexities about the Incarnation and Virgin Birth.[56]

Augustine and Ambrose were determined not to repeat procedures and approaches which might have inhibited the conversion of such men as Petronius Probus[57] and Volusianus. Such was the approach of Jerome whose ascetic training was blamed for the death and malaise of great Roman ladies. Added to this, the Sack of Rome (410 A.D.) further antagonized the pagan aristocrats who saw it as further proof of Christian "tampering" with ancient religious tradition.[58] How Augustine handles the latter problem we shall see below.

When the popes begin to exercise the role played by so many Christian bishops, that of defender, judge, even organizer of armies for besieged cities, we find Leo[59] after 440 A.D. continuing the tradition of including the Roman aristocrats in the carrying on of the life of the city, and now it is the Senate and the Pope who will act together, as the Roman Emperor becomes more and more of an "Eastern" figure, another instance

of the Church's assimilation of the best elements she could find in the culture: people as well as literary works. And when this communication took place, education proved the vital link, as art, architecture, and literature gradually fused the pagan and Christian forms of culture, so that Rome became for the Christian, as well as for the surviving pagan world, the privileged center of religious and cultural life, so that by the early Middle Ages, she is the focal point of honor and pilgrimage.

Pagans gradually came to see that the Church, too, understood, used, and preserved elements of Romanitas. Consider only the fact that her leaders were men trained in the tradition of paideia-humanitas: schoolmates of their own pagan offspring. The scions of aristocratic houses could gradually come to see Christianity as the force now operating to insure that the prized Romanitas and its civilization would be passed on. This Church seemed able to occupy two worlds, plus that of the despised and threatening barbarian, compared to the success of the imperial government with such intruders. She who had once seemed the greatest threat to culture was now through her missionary pastoral role its prime defender and disseminator. The Christianization of the Roman pagans was part of a social change which also produced the Romanization of the Christian Church. The somewhat narrow, exclusive nature of the educational system of the Hellenistic world, paideia, as Romanized into humanitas provided the vehicle of communication

which permitted such an assimilation and transformation. The system which to our age often appears empty and highly artificial was for its age an appropriate tool for such cultural change, for the fourth-fifth century world had "no humanistic or scientific horizon, no historical culture, no system of thought based on ethnology or sociology, no clear definition of its attitude to natural science, to say nothing of technology--all it had was literature, the essence of the culture of the time. The man of letters, trained in classical dialectics was the only type of educated humanity known."[60] Not only did such training and education give a man access to high imperial office and power; he prized them, also, because the culture had so sharply declined that each shred of culture was prized and cherished. The danger was not that such a system would bore Roman pagans; they were more afraid that it would disappear.

Once Christian leaders and their bishops began to exercise civil leadership in such a world, their possession of classical culture and education insured their entry into like positions of influence. Fortunately, many of them knew how to use such a happy historical chance. The Emperor was regarded as the exemplar and incarnation of the ideal of culture and education. As the Popes began to fulfill that role, too, in the West, they, also, saw that they were called upon to help in the work of preservation through working with the bearers of ancient culture, the senatorial class, and their habitat: Roma Aeterna,

XUM

of which they gradually became actual rulers.

It was this process of the use of education as bridge that Augustine would help shape and share and that he would face as he contemplated the tradition of Romanitas which the Graeco-Roman civilization of his time sought to preserve.

CHAPTER III

Africitas

Cultures, we have noted, seem to grow from the confluence of four streams to form a fourfold community of occupation, thought, place, and blood. Our look at paideia-humanitas in Chapter II supra tried to depict the formative phase of Augustine's world of thought, the world which had highest place in his formation of attitudes and consequent behavior. But, after 388, when Alypius and Augustine landed in Carthage, his thinking took place in the richly varied geographical background of Africa with its ethnic components as part of that richness. This Africa was the colorful, primitive and sophistocated, urban and agricultural world of the Late Empire, a melange of conflicting political, ethnic, religious and cultural strains.

If civilization is essentially the cooperation of diverse regional societies under a common spiritual ethos, it is still more: it has its own uniqueness which can shape the life of its regional societies as well. Imperialism, on the other hand, as we have seen it function in the West, forces unification from without. It can injure the local regional life, but it can also serve to enrich regional groupings as did Graeco-Roman civilization in its service to Hellenism. But imperialism can also be the vehicle by which peoples merge their lives and cultures. In the case of the indigenous people in our case, the North Africans, the invading people brought

XUM

them their own culture, that of Roman society, and its leading ethos: Hellenistic civilization, to blend with whatever regional groups could receive it. Its tool was paideia.

The success or failure of that cultural merger might be tested with some certainty by Augustine's time. Born at Thagaste (Souk Ahras) in November 13, A.D. 354, Augustine grew up in a town in the province of Numidia which had already seen some three hundred years of Roman civilization and imperial rule. The Punic Wars had made Rome heiress of the Carthaginian Empire. After 146 B.C., she had annexed for herself some of the fertile lands around Carthage, leaving much of the continental territory to Massinissa's heirs. Except for some six cities and Carthage, most of the land became ager publicus.

After Thapsus (46 B.C.) Caesar added to the province the Numidian territories of Juba I, and planned to restore Carthage as a Roman colony. Augustus pushed urbanization and placed the province under a proconsul at Carthage, but the westward expansion came from Claudius who organized the two provinces of Mauretania. After this annexation there seems to be very little trouble with the Moorish tribes, but, by the end of the third century, their aggression increased so that by the sixth, they were a real threat.

Roman Africa attained its greatest extent under Caracalla. It was a huge territory upon which the provincial organization of the Empire was imposed, and Diocletian's administrative divisions made it one of the fourteen dioceses of his autocratic

XUM

system.[1]

Society in this territory had undergone, along with the rest of the Empire, a transformation from principate to autocracy to theocracy under Theodosius the Great (d. 395 A.D.) whose own father had been executed in Roman Africa after uncovering the corruption of Roman officials there. During the reign of Valentinian I, (d.375) the African provinces had suffered from invasions, misgovernment and ultimately, from revolt. Theodosius somehow succeeded in maintaining the unity of imperial authority throughout the Empire till the accession of his sons, Arcadius and Honorius.

Augustine's Africa in 395, as he entered his episcopacy, was in the vortex of continual warfare, the prey of barbarians and tax-collectors, the scene of internal strife and religious warfare and controversy. Yet, till the Moslem invasion, Proconsular Africa, the most completely romanized of the provinces of Africa, seems to have maintained a higher degree of continuous prosperity than any other part of the Empire, even though a halt had come in that story of well-being which had covered the province with baths, amphitheatres, palaestrae, and civic architecture of every form during the fourth century, for decline, extortion, and corruption had become endemic to political and economic life.

Africa was an agricultural world with its towns and cities as oases of a civilization that was Roman. In spite of the emphases of Doctor Frend,[2] the Donatism we shall treat below

was not so specifically rural; the towns played an important role wherein the "traditional local aristocracy of *curiales* and *grammatici* tended to be either pagan or Donatist, while the new aristocracy of *honorati*, as dependents on imperial patronage, followed their masters into Catholicism,[3] Peter Brown feels that Christianity won in the West because it won the battle for the towns; it absorbed their culture, it transmitted this culture on its own terms; it had the best of both worlds: its urban structure and the recruitment of its bishops would constantly transmit the culture of an elite to large congregations.[4] This conquest was to be paid for dearly: gradual extinction based upon assuming the town-dweller's contempt for the barbarian.

Part of the African countryside was occupied by the great villas, the *latifundia* of the rich supported by slave labour in a sportsman's paradise. What was the vehicle of cultural contact for townsmen, farmers, landowners, officials, Circumcellions? The official speech was Latin, and Roman law was enforced in the lands near the network of Roman roads. But, as always, in the lands between, native customs and some form of native rule persisted. A force of about 30,000 men usually was enough to protect these four provinces of Roman Africa until the barbarian raids of the later fourth century.

The Augustine who grew up in this "granary of Rome" was a free man, son of Patricius "municeps Thagastensis admodum tenuis" (*Conf.* 2.3.5) and of a mother who reared him "in domo

fideli, bono membro ecclesiae" (9.8.17). Augustine at fifteen calls his father "adhuc catechumenus et hoc recens" (2.36). Patricius was of that number of town-councillors, or curiales, in straitened circumstances. He was probably of Roman colonial stock. More than that our actual knowledge of Augustine's origins is nil. He came from the population which lived on the plateau two hundred miles from the Mediterranean in Thagaste. They reflect clearly the cultural elements we have been noting above. They thought of themselves as Romans who were Africans, and therefore, who would call "Punic" whatever was not Latin.[5] When Marrou contemplates Augustine in this context, he says it would be "completely false to view him as an heir of the Punic past. . . his whole formation, his whole life's work, made him one of us, a European of the West."[6]

The factor of language as an essential cultural index makes even more fascinating the much-bandied question of the language of Augustine. I wonder if Augustine himself would agree with Marrou's description of the "Western European" Augustine? He never divorced himself from his own Africitas, and boldly reprimanded a correspondent (Ep.17.2) who failed to recall that he was an "African, writing for Africans, both of us living in Africa."[7] He goes on to say:

> . . .you could not have so forgotten yourself when writing to Africans as to think that Punic names were a fit theme for censure. . . And if the Punic language is rejected by you, you virtually deny what has been admitted by most learned men, that many things have been wisely preserved from oblivion in books written in the Punic tongue. Nay,

> you ought even to be ashamed of having been born in the country in which the cradle of this language is still warm.

This Augustine is the bishop who is sneered at later by Julian of Eclanum as the "Punic Aristotle" and philosophaster Poenorum, who ministered in Hippo Regius to a flock whose basic population was Libyan, a race like the modern Berbers. These people were infiltrated, as littoral folk, by the Phoenicians, Romans, Vandals, Byzantines, and Arabs. In their richly-layered culture during the fourth century one could never forget the pervasive influence of the Greek background of Hellenism wherever Roman cultural life flourished.

Here, a word about the languages of Augustine's milieu, for we are discussing the cultural envelope in which he operated. In it Christianity was in process of becoming a culture. We have seen it supra, absorbing the culture of the towns, a religion in a missionary hurry, a catalyst translating the Romanitas of imperial culture in Christian forms, and making it available to larger numbers. Christianity served a cultural function in this activity of widening the impact of the Latin language.

Neither the question of religion nor of language can be separated from the waxing and waning of the cultures which encompassed both Donatist and Catholic in North Africa. For this reason, as I have noted above, it becomes a bit simplistic to make Donatism appear as a conglomerate of rural, native, fanatic bands led by wild-eyed bishops. At times it did exhibit such characteristics, but, it must be repeated that by A.D. 395

XUM

Donatism had perdured through almost a century. When it began, its followers were fellow-Christians of their Catholic brethren. All had recently passed through a great persecution (Diocletians's). This point is well made by Frend who thereby restores somewhat the balance he had weighted in The Donatist Church,[8] for he notes what Brown insists upon: the new, confident Latin culture of the Christian Church, the healthy self-concept of the Christians of Africa as model to the Christian world.[9]

Brown adds to our rounded cultural picture of Augustine's ethnic and geographical backgrounds by challenging Frend's enthusiasm for the local and regional, what is associated with the continuity of an ethnic group as he seems to see the Berber-Donatist relationship, and especially his connecting this relationship with the resurgence of local cultures and their impact on social and political life in Africa. To Frend, Christianity in its gradual identification with the Emperors linked itself to their rule, and led to the rebellion of local groups against the Church as focus of their grievances, political or otherwise.[10]

We do know, however, that in Imperial times Africans probably spoke Punic, Latin, and Libyan. The natives, in general, would have spoken the Semitic Punic or African Libyan, the ancestor of modern Berber. Frend thinks that the language of Hippo Regius was Punic, while Berber was that of the people of the Numidian plains, but Christian Courtois denies any survival of Punic after the third century A.D.[11] Marrou contends that culture counts far more than blood in determining a man's race:

"ce qui compte, c'est la civilisation et non les chromosomes,"[12] and states that Augustine was, according to all probabilities, of pure Berber race.

Frend will call Augustine's use of the label "Punic" possible ignorance when he refers to the language in use in the Donatist Church: "Latinam et Punicam, id est Afram,"[13] basing such an observation on the fact that Hippo was a Roman town of Carthaginian origin, whereas Berber belonged to the peoples of less-Romanized Numidia, the differentiation we have noted and questioned above. Perhaps Augustine was not so much ignorant as Roman when he followed the general ascription of "Punic" meaning, especially, "North African," with no concern for distinguishing the indigenous from the Phoenician as equally applicable to Libyan or modern Berber, an approach shared by many Latin writers, e.g. Pliny: "Populorum eius (Libyae) oppidorumque nomina vel maxime sunt ineffabilia, praeter quam ipsorum linguis."[14]

The question actually posed here is the degree of successful Romanization in urban centers when we turn to the question of Augustine's so-called Africitas and the language of his oral communication. Certainly, Latin was his native tongue, the tool of his teaching. It was not for him a local dialect, this Africitas, but a slight local coloring of style, similar to what has been called Patavinitas in Livy. For the Latin of North Africa which Augustine used in its literary forms was the direct descendant of the Latin of the Golden Age marked conservatively

by local conditions, i.e., the regional culture.

It is noteworthy that Africa, so far as its literary and intellectual expression is concerned, created the Western tradition of a strong social concern for the concrete problems of corporate life, e.g. discipline and Church order. Frend sees this social concern, especially, for the poor, indigenous population close to village and tribal life as anti-classical, anti-imperial. The heretical schismatic forms of Christianity seemed to him to strike deepest root where native linguistic and cultural traditions were strongest and spawned a long line of heresies: Montanism, Novatianism, Donatism, and Monophysitism.[15]

Furthermore, the conditions we have seen supra in regard to educational conformity throughout the Empire helped produce in Africa writers, like Augustine, whose training and background were of one cultural mold with that of all other educated men, a fact whose significance cannot be exaggerated as we approach its ramifications from many sides. One can hardly forget that that larger part of Christian literature in Latin is African in its source. True, a strong national character marks the great African doctors, for the Libyo-Phoenician population, temporarily quiescent under Roman rule, revived in the nationalist movements of the Later Empire, and these found religious expression. This expression had no need of a new vernacular Christian literature. Hence, the expression was in a Latin mode, but its content was characteristically African. Fronto

XUM

and Apuleius are pale compared with the Father of African Christian writers, Tertullian, who castigates the Empire, Greek philosophy, and paganism (De Praescriptione, 7). His torrential style is indicative of the puritanical spirit characteristic of the African Church, and the cry became for those of his persuasion: "What has Carthage to do with Alexandria?"

When we look at these literary sources: Tertullian, Cyprian, Arnobius, Lactantius, Commodian, Tyconius, Petilian, we find ourselves in a great Western Christian tradition, that of apocalyptic, that of martyrdom, of hostility to classical paganism. Its history has been brilliantly delineated by Frend (n.8 supra) who sees this tradition as part of Western theology wherein the concept of the "Two Cities," Jerusalem and Babylon, was never to die out completely in Christian thought. Pagan society was characteristically rejected in such thinking. Lactantius tried to prove, e.g. that God took vengeance upon the persecutors, a concept born of apocalyptic and redolent of Maccabees and Josephus. Nor did he permit military service nor political activity: how could one put to death a man, a man whom God willed to be a sacred animal?[16] This thinking flourished in one part of the African Church from its very beginning. Sometimes these ideas were charged with hostility toward the injustice of the social order and the Empire itself. Of course, the cult of martyrdom in North Africa was of a piece with this intransigence, especially, among the peasant groups, a phenomenon which brought scorn

upon the Christians as we have seen in Maximus's letter (Ep.17).

What is at work here is not merely the ethnic and social influence of a region, but that of its ambit of values, beliefs, and attitudes. Geography, local cultural forms, environment -- all these were helpful in giving some characteristic flavour to theological thinking, but I must agree with Peter Brown and W.H.C. Frend that what actually operated were two disparate concepts of what it meant to be the Catholic Church. Especially, what it meant to be such in the civilization of Romanitas. One view of the role of a religious group in such a society was that "the group exists above all to defend its identity -- to preserve a divinely-given law, Machabaeico more; the other, that it may dominate, "baptize," and absorb, by constraint if need be, the society in which it is placed. The controversy of the age of Augustine decided in which of these two forms Christianity would come to predominate in Western Europe: "if it arose in Syria, it was in and through Africa that it became the religion for the world! (Mommsen, Provinces of the Roman Empire, II. 343)"[17]

In this chapter, however, we want to see how much and in what ways environment, local culture, and indigenous, ethnic forces did help to shape Augustine's developing theological concepts. Various modern writers pick up varied facets of the local coloring or Africitas which permeated his culture and that of his parishioners. Willis says the African liked the "clear cut," while Dawson calls African Christianity "fierce and

uncompromising in spirit." Frend notes that African Donatists of the fourth century were men who welcomed actual suffering linked with the theoretical duty of the righteous to renounce contemporary society and suffer persecution at its hands.[18]

The influence of the environmental factor and its essential note: the strength of the indigenous society, gave birth to a situation which would surface, challenge, and solidify Augustine's own regional bias, while confronting it with the values his classical education had built into his background. When the two world-views of church and society met in this cultural context, we have the Donatist Controversy. This juxtaposition of these two modes of Christianity we will treat infra; here we place it in cultural context. The lists were clearly drawn: "Out of Africa, said Tyconius, "all the Church shall be revealed. Antichrist must be revealed, as has been revealed to us in part."[19] The Donatists saw themselves as the true Church of the martyrs. Their proof? They were the persecuted ones, the perfecti, the puritans, the lawful heirs of Cyprian.

But this religious controversy also partook deeply of the national strains of social unrest, rebellion, and local loyalties inbred in the tribal and agricultural ties to the land. Very significantly, the controversy surfaced another form of rebellion: that of native groups against the imposed imperialistic form of classical pagan or Christian civilization which was all too clearly the mark of Antichrist. Africans reverted in the

fourth century to native forms of pagan and Christian worship and art rather than espouse those of official imperial society. Latin could well be the language of the inscriptions, but Berber was used in Donatist services in the country districts. Values which had governed the African's life for generations seemed to survive more freely under native Donatist ecclesiastical forms, and later, under Islam, than under the aegis of classical civilization. Hence, Frend insists that the Donatist schism was not merely such, but was part of a political, cultural revolution.[20]

It was inevitable that such a cultural and religious uprising, no matter what its explanation, should profoundly affect Augustine's attitudes and beliefs as a member of one culture and an official of another. The battle with the Donatists placed him in a position to experience daily their fanaticism and sectarianism. Reflection upon this experience seriously challenged his former attitudes toward Romanitas, toward imperial power and its role in history, and certainly, its part in the suppression of heresy and schism. But, first, the Christian story of the political, cultural scene in North Africa in its Donatist and Catholic phases. We will then conclude this chapter with the other side of the coin: a look at pagan culture in Africa: its religion and <u>paideia</u>.

As a result of the Great Persecution of 303-312 A.D., the Church in Africa had faced schism in the refusal of the Donatists to accept Constantine's decision. Two problems merged as a

XUM

result of the persecution and his espousal of the Church: 1) what to do about those who had lapsed: (traditores: those who had handed over the Scriptures, and those who had sacrificed to the pagan gods or to the Emperor's image); 2) what was to be the Christian's attitude toward that strange new phenomenon: a kindly-disposed Emperor?

In 312, the African Church already boasted a proud history of martyrdom, e.g. the brave death of Cyprian in 258 A.D. among others. His example of allowing the lapsed back after penance was followed by Donatus of Casae Nigrae, the leader of the movement, but the Donatists, in general, would have nothing to do with those who had surrendered the Scriptures. So when Caecilian was consecrated bishop of Carthage the Donatists contested the validity of the act, since one of his consecrators, Felix of Apthungi, was suspected as a traitor.[21]

A Donatist Council under Secundus of Tigisis condemned Caecilian's consecration as invalid and elected Majorinus in his place. The Donatist schism had begun: "one altar was set up against another" (i.15 & 19). And it went on even though Felix of Apthungi was declared innocent of traditio in 315, and Constantine, after careful investigation, had vindicated Caecilian in 316. And, so, when Augustine was ordained in 391 Donatism was eighty years old. Why had it perdured, and what was the connection of this phenomenon with the environmental and ethnic backgrounds in Augustine's attitude toward Romanitas?

Frend has suggested that the comparison of Proconsular

Africa and Numidia as to their economic, social, and geographical conditions helps explain the tenacity of the Donatist's hold on Numidia.[22] He cites, in particular, the great differences between the Donatist groups on the inland plains and the Catholics of the cities and towns of the Tell, seen, also, in that between the Berber-speaking parts of Donatist North Africa and the Latin and Punic speakers who were Catholics. The Donatist village churches excavated always seem to show a memorial of a martyr and the natalitia of these martyrs occasioned enthusiastic celebration.[23]

In general, in North Africa, as well as in Asia Minor and Egypt, the dissident forms of Christianity flourished where there was a strong native linguistic and cultural tradition. Economic factors added to the differences which helped nourish the continuation of Donatism on African soil, e.g. the wiping out of the middle class in Roman Africa towns from the revolt of A.D. 321 on. The burden of taxation and the supplying of the annona became ever heavier as the Empire declined. During the decline the Donatists found their chief adherents in the native inhabitants, the lower class in Carthage and the country areas, while the Catholics were found in the urban upper and middle classes. Frend singles out, nonetheless, the main cause of the anger of the villagers as not poor economy alone, but the extortions of tax collectors, soldiers, and the encroachment of the latifundia owners.[24]

From the time of Constantine till the Vandal invasion of

429 oppression steadily increased, for the Donatists certainly classed the tax-collectors and their rich masters as oppressors, enemies of God and of the true Church, so that we find Donatists clearly behind the revolt of Firmus against the infamous Count Romanus in A.D. 372.

The development of the Donatist Church was part of the total picture of the growth of Christianity in North Africa previous to 312 A.D. Hindsight cannot help but slant our sympathies to see the Donatists as schismatics, a sect which opposed the heroic Catholic Church bearing the heritage of Cyprian and Augustine, but, numerically speaking, fourth-century records show the Donatists in the majority in the country of the High Plains while Catholic strength was concentrated in the larger towns of Proconsular Africa.

In June of 411 at the Council of Carthage both sides struggled to equate their ranks, with a final muster of 286-Catholic to 284-Donatist, hardly a position of inferiority.[25]

The psychological and spiritual needs of the third century operated strongly in North Africa as well as in the general picture of the Roman Empire and Christianity knew a tremendous growth in that area in the period following 240 A.D. with the sharp waning of the pagan cults of Saturn and Caelestis.[26] In Numidia, conversions were almost a mass movement, a fact which accounts for the large number of martyrs in that area during the persecution of 303-4 A.D., since the Christianity these native groups espoused was strong and fanatical. It was not a

matter of intellectual enlightenment, but an answer to the questions and pious needs of a peasant population caught in the dissolution of Roman organization and rule from 235-285 A.D.

The proliferation and strengthening of practices of superstition, magic, and popular cults was nowhere more evident than in Africa during the same period of these conversions to Christianity. The substratum of such rites and practices indigenous to the native culture was not lost in the forms of African Christianity, particularly, Donatism, which seems to have flourished, especially, in the rural areas. Included in the cult of Saturn was a strong monotheistic element. God was Judge, not tender Father, a view which went along with other substrata of most forms of African religion: the belief in bodily resurrection,[27] and in martyrdom. Augustine, himself, called retribution in the next life a very sure punishment by God (Conf. 1.5). This kind of god was anthropomorphic, legalistic, vengeful, and to-be-lived-up-to. Logically, one placated him as ancient Romans had satisfied the spirits in their animistic rites. Fasts, penances, and, significantly, martyrdom itself, were all part of one's penitential service, one's propitiation. Tertullian stressed martyrdom as total expiation of sin.[28]

Attitudes such as these had cultural roots and provided strong motivations for superstitious minds, so it is not surprising to find the Donatist Circumcellions asking to be killed in order to win release from guilt and deliverance from such a god. Augustine knew and recognized this:

> But those who know what they (Circumcellions) were accustomed to do before the passing of the laws do not wonder at their deaths. . . vast crowds of them used to come in procession to the ceremonies of the pagans..not to break the idols, but that they might be put to death by the worshippers..sometimes, too, they offered themselves for slaughter to any traveler whom they met with arms using threats that they would murder them if they were not slain.[29]

Nor could conversion to Catholic Christianity be taken as indicative of giving up magic practices, apotropaic rites, prophylactic customs for the native population.[30] Augustine quotes such a Catholic in inimitable fashion: "Yes, indeed, I visit the idols, go to the magicians and soothsayers, but I do not leave the Church of God. I am a Catholic!"[31] Passage from African paganism to Christianity was not necessarily a wrenching experience, for Christianity in the mid-third century was not yet identified with the foreign Roman power. It did not handle local beliefs roughly, and understood how Berber dissenters from Graeco-Roman civilization could see it as a demonic expression and an oppressive power.[32]

Viewpoints such as these must needs conflict with those of another group of Africans who, like Clement of Alexandria, Eusebius, and their successors in the fourth century found coexistence with the imperial power possible, a hope which founded the Christian Empire of Constantine with Eusebius as "poet-laureate." He rejected the concepts of realistic eschatology and millenniarism. With Constantine as new David,[33] Constantinople revived the Hellenistic theory of kingship allied with the Oriental tradition of sacred monarchy. The Byzantine Church-

XUM

State was born.

Fourth-century Africa inherited both traditions and brought them strong cultural expression, but the emphasis from the local culture stressed apocalyptic, nationalism, resistance, rigor, ritual purity, persecution, social discontent, fanaticism, martyrdom. The movement was accompanied by an equally fanatical devotion to the Bible as a piece of arcane revelation, quite in keeping with the spirit of the times seeking gnostic secrets including the very name of God himself, a far cry from the approach of Gregory of Nyssa. The fundamentalists excluded all other testimony, all other writing, a position not acceptable to those who could live with the activities of the Church manifest in authority and instruction, co-operation with the Empire and its laws: the Catholics. Opposing them stood the Donatists, fired by their belief in the presence of the Holy Spirit through Baptism, itself based on ritual purity leading to release from the demons and their power. Of course, martyrdom only proved this close union with the Holy Spirit and gave the martyrs their charismata: forgiveness of sins, access to visions, and conversations with the Lord.

Out of such traditions, certainly, came the conflicting concepts of the Church we saw above. Those in the apocalyptic movement saw her as did Tertullian: She who "clothes with the Holy Spirit, feeds with the Eucharist, and exhorts to martyrdom,"[34] while the Catholics saw her composed of wheat and tares alike. In the West in the long period of peace after the Severan

persecution (212-250) this second, or Catholic, way of subsisting with the world of government, paganism, and philosophy, gradually gained strength, and was exemplified in the encounter between Callistus and Hippolytus. The former challenged the primacy of the gifts alone. He asked that they be channelled into the community through the ministry, respecting the weakness of its members whose sacramental communion was yet stronger than their defects.

So, gradually the individualist, the confessor, the prophet, the visionary and the martyr were no longer the sole exemplars of the gifts in the koinonia. In North Africa the peace encouraged this position in the more moderate members of the Church, but it was in Africa that the elements were also present for the only known resolution of the tension between individual inspiration and official corporate leadership so often present in Christianity. That fusion came in the Donatist Church, whose Bishops were seers, revolutionaries, and healers.

Augustine knew only too well the roots of Donatism in the tradition of apocalyptic, prophecy, and martyrdom which permeated the very air of his native land. He knew, too, that the action of Cyprian, abetted by the unripeness of the time, had warded off schism after the Decian persecution of 240 A.D.[35] Although Cyprian suffered some disfavor because he had hidden during the persecution, he had still come forward with clear legislation in regard to the confessors' claim to forgive sins, especially of the lapsed. Cyprian stated that the confessors

had glory, indeed, but that the bishop was directly involved in the glory of the martyrs and that he himself had obeyed a divine order in going into hiding, an explanation which would appeal strongly to the culture of his congregation. He said that the Church could remit deadly sin, even apostasy, and allowed his clergy to readmit to communion the lapsed according to each particular case.[36] His Easter Council in Carthage (251 A.D.) said that no one should be entirely outside of penance, but that lapsed clergy could not keep their office. Confessors, lapsi, priests, all must see their right of readmission in connection with the bishop. The conciliar aspect of these decisions was very important, also, for although the bishops spoke united in council, each also spoke from His relationship with the Holy Spirit.

The persecution and its aftermath left the African Church still strongly rigorist enough to maintain its stand against wealth, idolatry, official intervention in Church life, and with a strong bias toward suffering, martyrdom, respect for prophetic inspirations, visions, and dreams -- all in keeping with the milieu we have traced above.[37] Another of Cyprian's letters[38] contained his refusal to readmit a cleric who had lapsed, allowing avoidance of contact with him since sin could be passed on, according to African thinking, from generation to generation, an idea which will appear again in Augustine's view of original sin.

This emphasis on ritual purity and the contagion of the

XUM

sinful cleric led to the baptismal controversy of A.D. 312, since a man outside the koinonia of the Church surely could not be a dispenser of grace, of life anew in the Spirit. Therefore, baptism and every sacrament would have to be repeated on his turning again to the Church.[39] Stephen and the Roman Church saw it otherwise with tradition to show as well, for theirs was a wider view opposed to that of the narrow Church of the Elect which the African coterie seemed to envisage.

The persecution of Valerian had ended the impasse, for its heavy African phase through 258 and 259 claimed Cyprian as honored victim and martyr, along with many laymen and clerics. A new spirit of confidence and hope showed a marked advance over Decian times, and the African Church entered on the great phase of growth we have mentioned above.[40] But growth was suddenly doubly significant when Caecilian was elected Bishop of Carthage in 312--labeled as one who would compromise with the world and modify Cyprian's doctrine. Numidian numbers now counted for much coupled with the Carthaginian lower classes and the result of this strong combination was the actual possibility of a Donatist Church, for Numidia now had its own Primate, Tigisis, and under him the Numidians contested the election of Caecilian. Constantine, however, in need of a peaceful granary, declared in favor of Caecilian,[41] but his decision was most unpopular and the Donatists appealed to Caesar[42] on April 15, 313, and the young Church entered a new phase of relationship with the Empire: the emperor became the

arbiter of orthodoxy.

Constantine passed the judgment on to Miltiades who at the Lateran Council ruled against the Donatists and supported Caecilian, nor did the Council of Arles in 314 support them. But the condemnations had no effect on the entrenched views of the Donatists who could hardly change their attitudes toward Roman rulers so suddenly: from demons to servants of God and dispensers of His will! Numidia stood firm under the leadership of a unique leader, Donatus, known as a visionary, a reformer, and a miracle worker.[43]

Seventy-five years later when Augustine returned to Africa, it was to a Church divided. The Donatist Church, that of the perfecti and the martyrs boasted numbers equal to those of the Catholics in A.D. 388. They based their confidence on the fanatic devotion of the indigenous peasants, the threat of the Circumcellions, and leaders learned, powerful, and popular: Parmenian of Carthage, Emeritus of Caesarea, Petilian of Constantine, and Primian of Carthage,[44] not to mention their greatest writer, Tyconius.

In spite of such riches the schismatics nursed the seeds of their own dissolution: 1) a closed outlook; they felt that the church in Africa was the only surviving true Church. They restricted their activity to their own soil, and cut themselves off from forces which would have helped their ultimate survival. 2) their own sectarianism and exclusiveness led to schism within schism, e.g., that of Maximian, Primian's deacon, who

XUM

was supported by moderate Donatist bishops, but was excommunicated and denounced by a Donatist Council,[45] 3) as part of its social concern, the Donatist Church frequently allied itself with dissident political factions and rebellions, e.g. that of Count Gildo in 397 A.D. All of these tendencies, of course, made them odious to the imperial authority and prey to accumulated evidence in ecclesiastical councils.

To speak of these councils and their acts is to recall the sources for the story of Christian Africa at the turn of the fourth century. In regard to the Donatist Controversy, we face a great lack: the history, acta, literary remains from the Donatist side, especially, those of Donatus himself and of Parmenian, outside what we glean from their quoted works as found in Augustine, in particular. Frend's The Donatist Church gives an outstanding presentation of the African background of Augustine's period, however. He lists the sources for the period: Monceaux, Duchesne, the archeological findings of Graillot and Gsell, the works of Augustine, Optatus, and Possidius. Of course, the extra-African sources for this period mentioned supra (Ch. I) apply here: Ammianus Marcellinus, Commodian, Arnobius, Zosimus, Salvian, in regard to the history of the period and its literary remains.[46]

Frend cites questions still to be resolved (probably by a spade?): how did Donatus become the centre of the movement? What occurred in the great gap between the end of the Great Persecution to the death of Mensurius of Carthage? Especially,

what is the story of the seemingly mass conversions which took place between the death of Cyprian and the Great Persecution? The answers to these questions would give us badly-needed evidence about the growth of Christianity and the vitality of paganism in North Africa as background to how Africans saw classical civilization and its ethos. Archeology has begun the recovery of facts necessary for such a view, but we have only a beginning.

What we can ascertain about these questions, particularly, that of the conversions to Christianity from the death of Cyprian up to the Great Persecution, is partial and conjectural. Frend cites two chief reasons on the part of the educated pagan: in an age of pessimism and fear, they accepted the Christian promise of immortality for the believer, and they admitted the moral superiority of the Christian teaching over the paganism of the day.[47] Christianity seemed to be the one religion that embraced the sinner, promising salvation to all men without class or racial distinctions, yet this alone does not explain the conversion of such large numbers to Christianity among the lower classes also. We have seen the link with the prevalent cult of Saturn above and the hypothesis of a transformed popular religion, rather than a conversion to a new religion, e.g. the cult of the martyrs replacing the propitiatory sacrifices of the Saturnian cult, as a possible answer. Along with this religious fellow-feeling went the intransigent attitude of Christians and their leaders toward the State, e.g. Tertullian's: "Nothing

could be more alien to the Christian than the res publica" (Apologeticus, 38).

This third-century stance of intransigence continued for the Donatists on through the fourth, into the height of the controversy with Augustine (c.410 A.D.), but the Catholic party gradually became part of the imperial administrative picture. The result of such a history was the crystallization of faction and intensification of divisions; hatred, fear, ignorance, and superstition split the Donatist from the Catholic world. Optatus and Augustine mention the social consequences: no intermarriage, except if the Catholic changed his allegiance, no salutation exchanged, no burial in common cemeteries.[48] Add to this the schisms the Donatists suffered: the Maximianist, and the Claudian, plus their implication in the revolts of Firmus and Gildo. Not only did they suffer from the closed outlook of the perfecti, they had no workable solution to the problem of their place in regard to the State, no political sense. Their theology of the Holy Spirit which so strengthened their spiritual fibre bade them wait for deliverance from without; they came to no terms with the reality of the Empire, and the Catholics did. Given Catholic rapport with the Empire and control of the armies in Africa through Catholic officers, an encounter was inevitable. Augustine was ready for that encounter. So were Catholic clergy and bishops, many of them trained by him.

Finally, in 411, by order of Emperor Honorius, at the

request of the Synod of Carthage, the debate between Catholics and Donatists took place (Sermo 359.7 and 8). During the third session of the Conference in Carthage Augustine intervened[49] when Emeritus, one of the Donatist bishops, submitted a rejoinder for debate involving the whole subject of the controversy. Augustine handled the question of Caecilianus and that of the true Church. This opening up of events of a hundred years before led to the Catholic advantage, and finally, Marcellinus announced his decision in favor of the Catholics, but it was one thing to beat the Donatists in conference; another, to carry out such a decision. Ironically enough, the Christian Church had only seventeen more years of Roman imperial protection to solidify its program of restoration and reform: 412-429 A.D.

This, briefly, is the Donatist part of the Christian story of the Africa which served as backdrop for Augustine's developing attitudes. These we shall note in regard to the Donatist Controversy and its implications for his thought infra. But, now for the Catholic Christian story, the immediate environment for his priesthood and episcopate?

Hippo Regius, in small, can serve as an approach to the whole: Marec and Van der Meer have beautifully resurrected for us the hills and harbour of Augustine's episcopal city.[50] One cannot overlook the seaport location (Port Royal or otherwise!), for it made possible constant communication, along with the cornships, for one, to the northern Mediterranean lands, Italy,

in particular, and to the East, as well (Ep. 149.34). The sea and the land -- and the land meant corn on which Hippo flourished as seaport and trade center. But it also brought the social components associated with such resources: seasonal agricultural workers, affluent uncontrolled landowners, local merchants, imperial officials, sailors--all of these made preaching the Christian Gospel a challenging venture for the former Magister from Milan.

Hippo Regius was one of more than five-hundred bishoprics in Africa at the end of the century, grouped in six ecclesiastical provinces: Proconsular Africa, Numidia, Byzacena, Caesarian Mauretania, Sitifensian Mauretania, and Tripolitania. Augustine's own Hippo, a see of Proconsular Africa, depended ecclesiastically upon Numidia.[51] When Augustine became bishop there in 395 A.D., it was probably a town of some thirty or forty thousand inhabitants. After Carthage, it ranked second in Christian and pagan Africa Romana.

The supercilious judgment of the satirist who said that Africa was wasted on the Africans was echoed by Salvian much after Augustine's time when he called them the bilge-water of the Empire (De Gubern. Dei 7.15.63). His town was surrounded by the wide cornfields of the latifundia owners, often absentees, whose serfs and coloni were his parishioners, along with their masters and mistresses. Too often such field workers became Christians along with their owners or overseers, but they were by his time nominally Christians whose Punic

speech was a great obstacle to the preacher. Sharp social contrasts stood before him as he sat upon the cathedra and proclaimed the Word to his parishioners.

These Africans of his were characterized by a great vivacity and volatility; they were witty, superstitious, unstable, fearful, given to rage and excitement, violent, and even vicious. The Circumcellions were not an unusual manifestation, but merely a logical development of such qualities fed by religious fanaticism and social distress. But among his parishioners, Augustine would, also, see his aspiring monastic fellow-priests, fine laymen like Marcellinus, the sanctimoniales of his sister's convent; it was a real parish with the kind of human mixture which never changes: human nature in all its needs, desires, fears and joys.

Augustine knew his own people and he knew how to talk to them; he also knew when to keep quiet as in the famous incident in which his congregation tried to capture the rich Pinianus as their priest. Shouting, clapping, and weeping were all part of the milieu of his sermons to which he responded and of which he was an integral part. They lived and died on their public name, their reputation, these Africans, and held their honor dear. Witness Monnica's fierce shame at the remark of her maid, "Struck to the quick, she instantly condemned this fault in herself, leaving it quite...so that by the fury of one soul thou didst cure another" (Conf. 9.8.18). They could be a sarcastic, litigious, deeply loyal lot, whose religion was

XUM

bound to belief in dreams, ecstasy, aided by drinking, chanting, and dancing. Much of this flavor the educated Augustine would lose for a time, but it remained a part of his cultural background and would surface later in Christian forms.

As I have indicated, Christianity, as a missionary movement in a hurry, was actually creating a culture in Africa, but that culture, for a religion of the Book, had to be a Latin one, the form that Christianity, the common denominator of Donatist and Catholic, had taken in the Later Empire. Brown feels that the "rapid Christianization of Numidia involved, not a resurgence of any regional culture, but the creation of a Latin--or sub-Latin--religious culture on an unprecedented scale. The problems posed by the creation of a popular Latin culture are far more solidly documented in the literature of African Christianity than are the fleeting references to a lingua punica.[52] Donatists and Catholics alike, as they tried to present their form of Christianity to pagan confreres, used a "professional" Latin common to the African Church, but uniform with that of Rome. Both Brown and Marrou follow Harnack in stressing that this "clerical language with its solemn dignity, cold-blooded anger and misuse of Biblical words to interpret and criticize contemporary affairs remained common to both sides in the African Church.[53] We can imagine the problem then: how to adapt one's preaching style and language, one's pastoral conversation, to a bilingual society, trying to orient men to a religion presenting itself in a Latin reli-

gious cultural form, which radiated from the central core of a Latin holy book!

Paradoxically, this difficulty was helped to a solution by the cause of the problem itself: in the fourth-fifth century in Africa as elsewhere in the Empire, both religion and education were a path to upward social mobility. The uniform education of the time made possible the assimilation of the Latin religion of Christianity by the Latin religious culture of the Later Empire, even though the Latin of the former was an ideological language, a koine of the burgeoning Christian Church. This view does not stress the impact of Christianity upon indigenous peoples as a force for encouraging local traditions, but rather its incorporating them into the Latin culture of the Christian Church, both Donatist and Catholic. Both the new religion and the Latin culture it represented were entrées into the new, evolving culture of the Later Empire, especially, entrées into positions of prominence in both Court and Church.

When Augustine as a Catholic Christian bishop faced his congregation, his fellow bishops and clergy, the importance of classical education and its Romanitas become strikingly evident. Monceaux highlights the weak, somewhat passive condition of the intellectual leadership of the African Catholic Church from c. 340 to 386, a period of some forty years in which we hear of no more councils of Catholics in Africa. In the latter year a general council merely adopted canons passed by a Roman synod.[54] But very little attention was paid to the prevailing

Donatist schism, and only Optatus of Milevis tried to contact and convert the schismatics. After him neither council nor bishop seems to try to combat them. But the Donatists, after 355, under Parmenian, a distinguished leader, took advantage of the chance to reestablish themselves under Julian and soon outnumbered the Catholics in Numidia. In Hippo they had won over almost the whole town. Men like Emeritus, Petilian, and Parmenian, not to mention Tyconius, partook of Latin culture, were well educated ecclesiastics for the time and ready with their pens. The Catholic party had no such leadership, literary ability, nor spirit.

But with the change of leaders on both sides in 391-2, the year of Augustine's ordination, the situation changed. Soon Aurelius of Carthage began, at the Council of Hippo in 393, his concerted drive against the Donatists, sparked by the intellectual acumen and oratorical ability of his new priest, Augustine. The world in which Augustine would minister began to have an intellectual respectability due to the presence of Aurelius and his understanding and cooperation with the younger Augustine, and Augustine found himself chief protagonist. As the curtain rose upon a new phase in the life of the African Church his intellectual, spiritual, moral environment became extremely challenging; his resources were suddenly called upon, and for thirty years, until 420, when his last anti-Donatist work appeared, there would be no cessation. Under such prolonged bombardment, how would Augustine's attitudes

XUM

toward Romanitas develop?

It was because of the equipment he brought with him to the task, his classical education, that he would be able to represent the cause of the Catholic Church before Emperor, bishop, senator, and schismatic. Equipped as he was, he had the task of extending the religious literacy necessary for the task. He would hardly have regarded himself as burden-bearer for classical civilization, but bear it he did, for his was a religion of the Latin Great Book which he would somewhat testily defend against the "new" translation of his correspondent in Bethlehem! This was the ambit of the Catholic-Christian world, the ecclesiastical and pastoral world of Augustine's African milieu.

Lastly, his pagan African setting: in 391 shouting crowds demanded his ordination by Valerius in Hippo. In that same year, Theodosius I issued the first of the laws which gradually abolished not only pagan sacrifice, but pagan ceremonies as well.[55] A mighty hand helped remove one of the greatest obstacles to the role Augustine must play in the religious history of the Western Later Empire: the change from pagan to Christian religion and culture. But like all laws, Theodosius's decrees were not strictly enforced, and had to be re-enacted. In 407, in Africa, Honorius had to aid the work of the Church by issuing an order that temples, altars, and images should be removed. "Paganism was not so much a religion as a loosely-knit amalgam of cults, myths, and philosophical beliefs of varying origins

and even more varying levels of culture. Its main strength lay in the fact that it incorporated everywhere ancient cults, hallowed by tradition and fortified by local loyalty. Its misty pantheism gave glimpses of divine Unity; intellectuals used its myths, allegories and symbols as signs of esoteric truth hidden from the vulgar."[56]

True, the strongest appeal of the old gods was made to these cultivated classes, but the peasants were equally loyal. Paganism was, by the former, indelibly associated with their classical education, the prize of paideia of the ancient world. Yet, in the West these classes seem to have abandoned the pagan gods by the end of the fifth century. But when Justinian reconquered Numidia and Mauretania, the nomadic Moorish tribes he found there were still pagan. No rigid pattern can be imposed. We think of the rural areas and barbarian outskirts as remaining pagan, but some particular towns did the same. Christianity spread throughout Africa in the third century, but Calama, Madaura and Sufes were still strongly pagan in the early fifth.[57]

An interesting difference from the Roman pagan scene was the notable conversion of almost the entire aristocracy in Africa. Whatever the motivations, the number of pagans was gradually declining (De. div. daemonum 10.14). Yet, important intellectual opposition still existed in Africa, and Augustine had to take it into account. Maximus, the orator from Madaura would heckle Augustine with the marvelous question: "Just who

is this god of yours?" Augustine replied in the letter mentioned above (Ep. 17), not only significant for his defense of Africitas, but also because it was a trial-run for the arguments used later in the De civitate Dei.

Significantly, the very work in which Augustine gives his theory about demons is apt testimony to the current, shared Christian and pagan belief in demons who were considered powerful and dangerous. The austere monotheism of the early Christian church did not long satisfy the religious needs of converts whose culture had been permeated by such beliefs, and the cult of the martyrs in Africa, the building of memoriae, or chapels over their tombs, popular festivals in their honor proliferated, and, gradually, the bodies of the martyrs acquired a kind of magical power.[58] Although some pagans ridiculed such practices, particularly, that of reverence for relics, pagan practices such as the use of charms, amulets, magic rites, and sorcery flourished equally among them until the Church's explanation of misfortune as due to suprahuman agencies gradually succeeded in bypassing the human agent of such misfortune. It offered an explanation that both embraced all the phenomena previously ascribed to sorcery, and armed the individual with weapons of satisfying precision against them.[59] This tendency within a new grouping of Roman society, such as the Church in Africa, led to an identification of the powers of evil as outside the fold, and paganism and magic became identified for Christians. Once within the Church, men were delivered from the demons, and

the new community resolved its tensions by projecting them in the form of a greater demonic menace from outside.[60] We will see the application of this idea of Brown's below in studying Augustine's attitude toward evil active in society.

In any case, superstition was rife among his Africans, for pagans had always believed in magic, divination, and astrology, even though they were criminal offenses as early as the Principate. Iamblichus, in the reign of Constantine will contradict the skepticism of Plotinus and Porphyry about theurgy, and will defend the practice of magic, while Maximus won Julian's adherence by his practice of miracles.[61] By mid-fourth century the accounts of great Christian miracles flood in along with the cult of martyrs. Augustine even set up a system of publicizing them adequately, and relates his own eye-witness account of the cure of Innocentius (CD 22.8) along with a long series of accounts derived from the libelli in his collection of miracles.

The accounts of miracles here recorded was part of the flood of such literature and symptomatic of beliefs which led to the high hagiography of the Middle Ages, but for Augustine's time, it is a prime indicator of the social and cultural context in which he would develop his thought. A man of his education and intelligence found them important, and this importance was part of the growing credulity of the time, but, also, part of the transfer of strong psychological and social tendencies from pagan to Christian manifestations: new forms

of solutions to the problem of evil, the search for identity, for the good, true, the eternal.

Augustine had so deeply shared in that search, that, as a man of his time, he, also, could but transfer his former modes of reconciling his questions with experience into a new Christian context. In Epistle 78, we see such a transfer in his sending two of his contending clergy to the shrine of Felix of Nola in Italy to tell their conflicting stories. He was a man of his time whose theology was culturally informed, as it is in any age, and his pagan environment could not but influence him. Although he had lived in a Christian home from infancy, the surrounding milieu of Thagaste, Madaura, Carthage, Milan, Rome still smelled of pagan religion and culture, and, though he resisted actual pagan belief and allegiance, given the kind of mother Monnica was, still it would be impossible for him not to imbibe something of the strong attitudinal system which pagans had imposed upon society. He lived in a world in flux, caught in the throes of dynamic social change, not least of which was the clashing and melding of pagan and Christian values and beliefs. His experience of this traumatic change in himself lent depth and immediacy to his relationships with his own African congregation.

CHAPTER IV

Peregrinatio Africana

Before we approach the evolution of Augustine's attitudes toward Romanitas, a pause at the peak and a "re-gard" is in order. Chapter I of this exposition concentrated on the concept of Romanitas, and on the religion of culture which gave it birth. Chapter II dealt with the chief instrument by which that Graeco-Roman culture and its mystique, Romanitas, were directly conveyed and transmitted to one's offspring in a period which clung more strongly to the classical value system as its richness and content waned: Roman Education. Chapter III considered elements of Chapter I and II as found in the environment of Roman Africa of Late Antiquity, and, in particular, in the religious and cultural milieu of Augustine's ministry, North Africa.

In surveying these backgrounds, I am more convinced than ever that simplistic accounts of how this multi-faceted world of Augustine's evolved from Classical to Late Antique are, of course, quite inadequate, if we view them as answers to how Romanitas lost its aura in the Later Empire. The more we know of human psychology and sociology the less we are satisfied with a history by "catastrophe" as an explanation of change, particularly, social change. So, also, the metamorphosis of the fourth-fifth centuries A.D. from a pagan, to a semi-Christian milieu was a highly significant, perhaps

the most significant feature of the total socio-cultural change which led to the Middle Ages, but it took place in the gradual changes effected in men's minds as they changed their values, attitudes, and hence, their life styles as Romans in that fluctuating milieu.

It is all very well to be amused at historians who exit and entrance their periods of history on December 31 and January 1 of succeeding years in a carefully-calculated vivesection of the past, but I feel that such surgery still affects us when we reflect upon this very period of the fourth-sixth centuries A.D. Recent writers are beginning to repair such a clinical viewpoint, e.g., Dr. Frend, whose treatment of the loss of the southern Mediterranean to the Roman world well illustrates this growing awareness of a continuity between ancient and medieval history and prevents such decided periodic divisions from causing our misunderstanding such a process.[1]

Nevertheless, in the period after Constantine and his sons we meet a lacuna in historical analysis caused neither by barbarians nor barren sources (they are an <u>embarras de richesse</u>!), but by lack of appreciation for the Christian element as a major part of the story of social change in this period of so-called decline and historical change.[2] This lacuna is now being filled by the work of men like Frend, Brown, and A.H.M. Jones whose work enhances the study of Augustine's attitude toward Romanitas and plunges the writer

into this time of fascinating flux in the socio-religious life of the period. Of all the Christians who theologized in and about that flux, Augustine is the most significant.

To study the period, I will reverse Plato's process, and study this world in small, in this one extraordinary man who so thoroughly embodied so many facets of that multi-cultured time. His extraordinary odyssey took place in the uncharted waters of a society caught in major social and religious upheaval. No more than our own, could the men of that time know, for want of perspective, how extensive, how profound that change was or would be.

True, Constantine's decree probably came as a deus ex machina epiphany for the embattled Christians -- and their literature shows the effects of such euphoria in the works of Lactantius and Eusebius. But, to the pagan subjects of the Empire, this settlement of the troublesome "Christian Question" could hardly have foretold the demise of the pagan religion. Yet, by A.D. 400, thanks to Theodosius and his sons, Christianity was both the privileged religion, and paganism found itself legally outlawed; pagan temples stood empty (Cod.Th.xvi,x.18); statues and altars were demolished (Cod.Th.xvi.x.19), and the property of heretics was handed over to the Catholic clergy, e.g., in the Donatist controversy.[3]

This great about-face in pagan society took place within the compass of the fourth century, but there was more to come:

after 405 A.D., in Africa, the imperial laws forced Donatists into the Catholic Church, producing the much feared (by Augustine) forced-and-feigned conversions (Ep.93.v.17). Actual fines were imposed on the schismatics; slaves were even beaten if recalcitrant to persuasion of the Catholic variety (Cod.Th. xvi.v.52). This was certainly the use of force to effect social and religious change. Its effects can not be measured adequately, for the Vandal invasion all but wiped out the Christian Church.[4] The extent of that loss Brown sees as a power shift:

> In Africa, at least, the hinterland of the Mediterranean had been lost to Roman civilization, and the hold of this civilization on the seaboard had been tragically weakened, as early as the third century. Far from being a sudden and violent rupture, the rise of Islam only made irreversible this shift of the balance of power to the South -- away from the Roman Mediterranean. By the eighth century the process is completed: the maritime world of Carthage and Alexandria has given way to a world whose power was exercised from inland cities. . . and whose religion was orientated away from Rome and Constantinople to Mecca.[5] (See here p.274 infra for important addendum)

[6]So it is with Augustine. Along with the cultural anthropolotist and the social historian, we too, would like answers to these questions in his regard. Behind them all, stands the question of norms and values: how Late Roman men saw themselves, and how they coped with the perennial questions of who they were, where they were going, and what the whole enterprise meant. In search for answers, in relating to one another, in reacting to one another, in reacting to their own experiences,

in coping with the challenge of new patterns: views, beliefs, barbarians, catastrophes, they lived from the patterns of their classical past and found them challenged. The division between the Classical and Late Antique worlds which opened wide at this time must be approached through the changes, then, which took place in the minds and hearts of men as they adjusted to their changing milieu and its varied experiences. That division can be discovered and explored as much through what they wrote, bought, valued, created, how they spent their time -- in short, in their life styles, their values lived -- as through the political and economic history of the period.

At this point, the writer acknowledges most frankly that desire for such data is not possible of fulfillment without help from other disciplines, particularly, some of those above mentioned: psychology, sociology, and cultural anthropology. Insights from these sciences help the historian and the theologian to interpret data from our subject, Augustine. But all the help in the world, it must be stated, will not solve conclusively the mystery of his motivation or of his relationship with God, no matter how beautifully he expounds these as he sees them, for never is all the data in. As Solon put it: "No man is declared happy until he is dead."

More important, in spite of the great gift of the Retractations, Augustine had about three more years of experience in which to change or refract the views he there expounded. Always Augustine evolved; what we discover about him is not

XUM

static, finalized material, but always his thinking is in via; out of such working-through, such careful dialectical analysis, came many of the attitudes which then guided his behavior. Yet, typically, once he had won a hard-fought position, e.g., that on free will (Retrac.II.27), he clung to it with all of that same dialectical skill: witness his struggle with Pelagius and Julian of Eclanum.

In other words, Augustine reveals himself as a fully-rounded, sensitive, human being, intelligent to the point of genius, yet a well-trained and responsible thinker who will try all his life to understand his own experience and will work tenaciously toward that goal. His disquieting uniqueness, like that of even our most intimate friends, remains ever elusive, yet, of all ancient writers he is closest to us, for he, himself, was profoundly intrigued by this very uniqueness in each man he met; he too, wondered at the mystery of motivation. He, too, was deeply struck by the impossibility of truly understanding another human being completely in this life.[7] And that impossibility was part of an even greater: that man should attain completeness here. The human personality will only be fulfilled at the end of time.[8] That view had certainly evolved; it was the opposite of the attitude of the young Augustine.

It would seem that his attitude toward Romanitas, too, would be an evolving one. But, what do we mean here by attitude? I see it as a more or less fixed tendency to

perceive, feel about, and behave in a characteristic way in regard to a person, situation, or thing. Significantly, an attitude includes the element of how one sees: vision. Above all, attitudes are hardly the product of intellection exclusively; they are complex entities formed by many unconscious as well as conscious factors from what a man values and cherishes: his value-systems. Even negative or destructive attitudes proceed from fear of losing some cherished value or anger against a person or system which threatens a value.

Even more fascinating is the genesis of values or to use Augustine's phrase - those things a man loves! A value becomes such if it is chosen freely, prized, publicly practiced, and ultimately, if it is to survive, it is patterned into a habit, or part of a way of life. Habits can lift a man or chain him back. How well Augustine knew that: "I find myself held fast; I weep much, yet I am held strongly (Conf.VIII.10). The load of habit, vis consuetudinis, is a power to be reckoned with. But to turn the coin, a good habit was a virtue, and the greatest of these was caritas.

A thing has value if it deserves to be wanted.[9] And how many things appeared to Augustine as things to be wanted! One day he will call some of them nugae (toys) (Conf.8.11).

In regard to Romanitas, we can find the matrix of his values in his culture, education, experience, his environment, and from his expectations: what we would otherwise call the whole range of a man's unique, individual background. It is

part of the mystery of his uniqueness, or of what the behavioral scientist will call "the privacy of human experience" based upon the startling differences in each human person.

To investigate such a terrain-psychologique is a siege-perilous! The monsters of assumption-extraordinary hide ready to play one false. Brown is intrigued by the application of psychoanalysis to his own study of Augustine: "Just as the modern psychologist can perceive significant patterns and relations in the apparently unrelated and somewhat trite remarks of a patient, so the historian must use refined tools to seize the full implications of explicit statements of Augustine's. ."[10] He also warns against trying to fasten an academic consistency upon Augustine's thought, this man of "mysterious discontinuities."[11] But a man of continuities, too, for when we look at how Augustine looked at Romanitas, we realize that he looked with the eyes of a Late-Roman African bishop, but with the mind and heart of the young man who wept under the fig tree (Conf. 8.11). Nothing was ever lost, it merely accumulated in his background.

Chapters IV and V will attempt to note how Augustine's evolving attitudes formed from the all-encompassing daily care for the flock: from his pastoral experience and from his expectations. That experience, in turn, would shape and reshape his values and attitudes, which finally sparked his activity: how he preached, prayed, spent his precious time, counseled, judged, accepted or rejected contemporary values

XUM

in the evolving process of his pastoral life. Inexorably, the rhythm of external events and internal motivations constantly fed him new data, and created a dynamic which produced change, change under pressure, but change always conditioned by the mystery of his own private experience of faith, of his relationship with the Spirit, and his pilgrim search for the two great values (loves) of his life: God and the soul (De. ord. 2.18.47).

It is within the framework of that search that I intend to do my searching, its scope in time limited by the Donatist Controversy, but its present, ever conditioned by Augustine's past and future: memoria and desiderium, desiderium sinus cordis, the longing that widens the heart, his expectations, his longing for the City of God. At all times, it will be necessary to look outside the Donatist writings of Augustine to understand the experiences, events, persons, and reactions which constantly helped shape his background, challenged or strengthened his cherished values and precipitated his actions, often produced quite suddenly under such pressures, where ideas, which, previously, had evolved slowly and imperceptibly, came together with great speed and power -- a phenomenon common to Augustine's thought.[12]

But, first, a look at the spiritual and theological atmosphere of the Christian-Catholic Church in which Augustine served as official and member, and then, at the events and the tenor of the events in the extra-ecclesial imperial civitas

which impinged upon his striving to serve: the Roman Empire. It is deceptively easy to confine Augustine to the category of saint -- and so pin him safely to his fresco portrait in the Lateran -- or to the category of bishop -- and keep him in Hippo and Carthage. Neither of these classifications describes the wide scope of his influence, nor the impact of his reputation abroad, whether in Rome, Bethlehem or Gaul.[13] His seaport location, his zeal, his role as bishop, judge, writer, and counselor and holy man, involved him deeply in the life of Africa and the Empire both on the political and ecclesial levels, for after Constantine, the inter-play and collaboration of these two powers was an accomplished fact.

First, the climate of the Ecclesia Mater during this period was one of spiritual reawakening: the rise of a spiritual movement that influenced Jerome, Gregory of Nyssa, and Gregory of Nazianzus, let alone Augustine. The work of Evagrius Ponticus, e.g., also gave the movement clear mystical and ascetic form. Meanwhile, monasticism had developed and spread quickly in Egypt, Syria, and Asia Minor, and Augustine will meet it in Milan (Conf.8), and reproduce it all his priestly life in Hippo. The cult of the martyrs we noted above, and pilgrimages to holy places such as Jerusalem and Rome assumed a prominent place in devotional life and gave rise to a literature that further encouraged monastic and ascetical practices.[14]

Jerome encouraged this movement in Rome and attracted

aristocratic women into celibate communities of great strictness, while he, himself, provided new translations of Scripture, and through his erudition, put Biblical study, exegesis, and Christian literature on a scholarly basis. In these movements, Augustine participated, and was himself magna pars. His own conversion in A.D. 386, coincided with the ordination of John Chrysostom in the East, and led to a theological rebirth in the West which had, until his time, depended largely through Ambrose and Rufinus on the Eastern Fathers.

Meanwhile, in this fascinating transitional period for the Church, two theologies reflected the multiform complexity of her life: Alexandria, with its insistence on Christ's divinity and an allegorical interpretation of Scripture in quest of man's divinization in Christ, and that of Antioch which emphasized man's perfection through Christ's humanity in the Resurrection, and a literal interpretation of Scripture. Their differences were in the theological air Augustine breathed: first, in Milan and Rome whence Jerome had departed in bitterness (August 384), and later in his own African Donatist and Pelagian disputes. The Christological aspects of these differences found resolution in the Council of Ephesus (431), Chalcedon (451), and, finally, Constantinople (553). Augustine found himself in the vortex in which these issues were being resolved in his daily care for the faithful of Hippo.

In Augustine's lifetime, eight bishops headed the Roman See. In his infancy one of these suffered exile, Liberius, but,

XUM

in general, after the death of Julian (363), physical threat from Emperor and pagan world came to an end. But, what emerged from the peace was, for Augustine, an even greater danger: the insidious, creeping, day-to-day threat of conformity to this world. He had witnessed Ambrose's defense of the rights of the Church in Milan against Justina and Theodosius (Conf.9.7), but he knew, also, that after four hundred years of Christianity, the Church, ever, as he saw her, on pilgrimage, in peregrinatione, was endangered in her interior life by the external cessation of persecution and the threat of absorption by imperial and secular involvement.

He himself experienced daily what it was to be a judge in an audientia, a man who literally "worked for the emperor," although Augustine presided in the secretarium near his own basilica. A bishop was sought after as judge because his was thought to be a neutral, uncorrupted voice which might render justice to the plaintiff.[15] The Christian bishop could impose a settlement, by arbitration, on willing litigants (Vita, 19.1-5) who mobbed his hearings, consumed his day and caused him real frustration: ". . . those men who fight each other stubbornly in our court, and when they set out to oppress good men, spurn our judgments, and make us fritter away time we could devote to providing divine things. . . It is as if the Psalmist was swatting them away like flies dancing before the eyes. . ." (Conf.6.16).

This was an experience which constantly shaped his attitudes

toward authority, responsibility, and his own role and that of the Ecclesia Mater. It was not for nothing he carefully selected his priests, soon insisted that they live in community and extreme simplicity with vows of celibacy, poverty, and a rule.[16] They became, then, just what he desired: a loud voice speaking against the culture of the time, a separate group involved neither in societal life by marriage nor the economic life of the town by investment. They were a sign of contradiction. This was one way in which Augustine struck back at the tentacles of the octopus: the cultural patterns of the good life, of Romanitas.

But he knew pressure from the civitas terrena, also: from 354 to Augustine's death in 430 eleven emperors would rule. Born under the rigorist, Constantius II, he was perhaps vaguely conscious of the pagan revival under Julian, who died in battle (363). The founder of the Pannonian house, Valentinian I, died of a stroke, and his brother, Valens, on the field of Adrianople (378); the news of that disaster would have reached the twenty-four-year old Augustine teaching in Carthage.

The son of an officer whose execution in Africa might have been ordered by Valentinian, Theodosius I reigned as Emperor when Augustine reached Rome in 383. His reign was soon contested by the revolt of Maximus in June of that very year, and famine raged in the city whose Prefect, Symmachus, would send Augustine to Milan as Professor of Rhetoric in the autumn of 384. But not before he heard of the violent death of another Roman

ruler, Gratian, slain at the age of twenty-five.[17] Yet, perhaps, the death of that prince helped Augustine's own appointment to the chair of rhetoric in Milan. It was a small part of the pagan reaction which surfaced after Gratian's demise, that, in 384, most of the chairs were actually held by pagans. Augustine's appointment would have been a piece of tactics in that pagan strategy for Symmachus to send this young Manichee to his rival, the Christian Ambrose, in Milan. Augustine, fourteen years younger than the bishop recalls: "I was unknowingly led to him by you, so that through him I might knowingly be led to You. . . and I then began to love him. . . as a man who was kind to me." (Conf.5.13;14.24). Nor could Augustine be ignorant of the removal of the Statue of Victory from the Curia and Ambrose's and Symmachus's part in that controversy.

He certainly witnessed the triumph of Ambrose in the affair of the basilicas, and his discovery of the bodies of the martyrs Gervasius and Protasius.[18] That very summer his own conversion took place and his retirement to Cassicaum ended with baptism at the hands of Ambrose on April 24, 387, after this catechumen had listened to the bishop's Lenten homilies: the Hexaemeron, Ambrose's greatest exegetical work, based on that of Origen, indeed, but as Jerome noted, it was merely a revision of that writer, with much more allegiance to those of Basil and Hippolytus.[19] If Augustine heard homilies from the sixth book delivered by the eloquent bishop they would lie

XUM

deep in his mind some day when he meditated long upon the purpose of human life and found his priorities: God and the soul: "God found his rest in the depths of man. . . in his mind and his will. . . he made man and then found rest in one whose sins he might forgive." (Hex.6.75-76).

In the very year of Augustine's ordination as priest in Hippo (391), the skill of Theodosius and Stilicho put an end to Gothic raids. War was delayed for a time, but by May of 392 the young Valentinian II was dead, probably murdered by the Frank, Arbogast, who refused to resign for the young Augustus. Significantly, Arbogast proclaimed the prominent rhetorician, Eugenius, as Augustus in his place. Instead, Theodosius appointed his younger son Honorius Augustus in 393, and Eugenius marched on Italy to the delight of the pagan party who welcomed him in Rome, while the commander in Africa supported him. Finally, Theodosius took the offensive against Arbogast and Eugenius with their superior forces at the Frigidus (394) in northeastern Italy, and won a complete victory. Eugenius was captured, beheaded, and Arbogast killed himself. Theodosius died in 395 and Arcadius, at eighteen, ruled the East; the younger son, Honorius, at eleven, was Augustus in the West.

But power resided in the hands of Rufinus, praetorian prefect of Illyricum in the East, and more firmly in those of Stilicho, Vandal master of the soldiers, in the West as regent for Honorius. Their rivalry brought to an end the presumed unity of the two halves of the Roman Empire, though the fiction

of unity was preserved by nominating one consul in Rome and another in Constantinople, and issuing imperial edicts under joint names. Yet, complete separation of imperial authority was a fact. After 395, edicts in one part of the Empire did not need the signature of the ruler of the other.

At this very moment in Africa, Augustine will be consecrated bishop in Hippo, while Gildo, Count of Africa, revolts against Western Roman authority, aided by Optatus, Donatist Bishop of Thamugadi, the most important bishopric in southern Numidia.

This last decade of the fourth century witnessed the high point of Donatist power in Africa, yet the revolt of Gildo and internal factions and schisms, e.g., the Maximianist,[20] eventually led to disaster. But in 397, Gildo was in actual control of Africa and so were the Donatists. The effect on the Catholics was disastrous: churches burned, clergy beaten, property destroyed: the Circumcellions raged.[21] But Gildo quarreled with one of his brothers, and murdered two of his children.[22] The brother, Mascazel, found support for his cause in Italy and returned against Gildo. By this time rioting and Catholic harassment were so bad that Honorius (398) issued a rescript: the death penalty against the persecutors (Cod.Th.16.231). A month later Gildo was defeated by his brother. Both Gildo and Optatus were killed.[23] Frend interprets the Donatist failure as that of failing to solve the problem of the relationship of Church and State. "Lacking a conscious political aim, they

waited the hand of God. . . to remove their oppressors. . . fanaticism and fatalism were not the foundation on which a new system of society could be built."[24] Mascazel was murdered; the native power was ended; Catholics controlled the army, the imperial government, and the religious field. Aurelius of Carthage and Augustine would now lead the battle to wipe out the vestiges of Donatism, and the Council of June, 411, merely capped a fait accompli -- but one accomplished through the use of imperial power. Church and Empire together fought religious dissent and political rebellion in Africa.

Outside Africa another force was converging to change the life of the Church: the factor of the barbarians. In 395, Theodosius' death signalled an opportunity for Alaric, Visigothic chieftain, to take advantage of the lacuna to ravage Thrace and Macedonia. He was opposed by Stilicho, but extorted the title of Master of the Soldiers from the eastern court. Stilicho soon fell victim to intrigues at court and was executed in 408, removing the only capable defender of Italy, so that Alaric marched on Rome and set up a new emperor, Attalus, whom he soon deposed. Finally Alaric plundered Rome for three days (410), and marched south toward Sicily, but lost his fleet in a storm. Returning northward, he sickened and died. Subsequently, Alaric's brother-in-law, Ataulf, led the Visigoths to Gaul (412) where they eventually were settled in southern Aquitania (418).

In 405 the Vandals and Alans had come down into Italy, but were defeated by Stilicho. But the following year, along with

the Suevi, they plundered Gaul as far as the Pyrenees, and soon reached Spain (409), which they promptly occupied as Roman foederati with grants of land. The Romans manipulated the Visigoths in 416 to attack the Vandals, but by 429 the Vandals recovered and crossed into Africa, helped by the war between Count Boniface, military governor of Africa, and the western emperor. Some estimate their number at 80,000, of whom perhaps 20,000 were fighting men. In this invasion, Augustine's Hippo was besieged.[25]

It is significant that Constantius III, a Roman noble who succeeded Stilicho as Master of Soldiers and mainstay of Honorius, was leader of the antibarbarian faction at court, and his attitude strongly influenced Honorius's feelings toward, and legislation concerning the invaders. This attitude was certainly reflected in the church leaders of the time, e.g., Ambrose, and Augustine. At the death of Honorius in 423, Theodosius II installed the five-year old son of Galla Placidia and Constantius III in Italy, and Galla Placidia became regent with the title of Augusta. Aetius, the so-called "last of the Romans," became Master of the Soldiers and real wielder of power in the West. Placidia tried to engineer his downfall by appealing to Count Boniface in Africa, who, after his revolt in 427, fought for the Empire against the Vandals. Aetius actually forced the emperor to reappoint him to his command as patrician by 433. He ruled the West till his death in 454.

So ran the world in which Augustine fed his flock. What

comes together in these amazing thirty years of major political, social, cultural and religious change is exactly that. The components of this process from 390-420 as they impinged upon Augustine's consciousness unroll on the wide canvas of his milieu. The predominant color was red -- blood red. As I penetrate ever more deeply into this Late Roman world, listen to its men and women, observe their thinking, feeling, reacting, when I watch the imperial political story with Augustine's eyes, I find one long red smear of violence: revolution, murder, suicide, treachery and death. I cited that history very simply above in its bare factual dimensions, but when one analyzes that story from the angle of the human, the social, the psychological and sociological, not to speak of the theological viewpoints, one finds Augustine constantly subjected to an image of the Roman Empire, of its rulers and of his fellow Africans as men of power who fought for power, and suffered from its violent use against themselves.

The very emperor Augustine eulogizes suffered the tragic loss of his father, the elder Theodosius, on African soil, perhaps treacherously executed after quelling a rebellion and unmasking corruption. Valens fell in the last-chance of Roman military power: Adrianople, and his fall let loose violent forces never again controlled, the barbarians. Gratian and Valentinian II were both murdered in a power struggle, as were Eugenius and Stilicho, Gildo, and Optatus of Thamugadi, while Arbogast killed himself. These were the men who gambled, gave

their lives for power -- and lost the violent game in Augustine's immediate ambit.

As he walked through the streets of Hippo and Carthage, rode through the countryside green with corn, spoke from the cathedral, violent men continually shattered his thought and aroused his fear and anger. Possidius barely escaped with his life from the Circumcellions (C.Cresc. III. 46.50) as did Augustine himself (Poss. Vita Aug. 12). Their violent measures were the constant refrain in his communications, e.g., to Macrobius, Donatist bishop in Hippo: ". . .slaves are not only alienated from their masters, and are not content with threats, but pass to the most violent attacks and robberies at their expense. They have for their leaders your confessors, the agonistici (Militants), who honour you with shouts of "Deo Laudes," and to "Deo Laudes," spill the blood of others." He calls the Donatists "herds of abandoned men disturbing the peace of the innocent in the spirit of most reckless madness. . .the threat of beating, burning, instant death . . .the houses of innocent persons either razed to the ground or burned. . .whoever tried to avenge people killed in the massacres. . ."[26]

He watched the Donatists, the Circumcellions, and the barbarians throughout the Empire wielding naked power, and meditated, too, on the power exercised in his own life. As judge in the audientia, he feared his own use of power (Ep. 77.2); he saw himself as one of the judges of Israel, his judgments subject to the Last Judgment, and the God of the African

Christians who was the Great Judge (de cat. rud. xiii.18).

His mother had been adamantine (Conf. IX,ix,22). Her sheer, dogged resolution helped Augustine through his schooling, his release from his concubine, and into his conversion, while Patricius made sacrifices for his education with equal determination (Conf. II,3). He was surrounded by such Africans whose blood feuds, violent tempers, fierce friendships, ecstatic religious experiences, belief in dreams and visions shaped his attitudes toward all religious phenomena and his own experience into habits of thought and action which lay deep beneath the polish of the philosopher and the rhetorician. His early life as schoolboy, the dreaded floggings, his guilt-ridden relations with Monnica over his Manicheism and his concubine, his struggle for success with his students -- all of these were part of the battle upward through the social strata of the late imperial structure and all were part of the tension, self-doubt, and pain he experienced en route.

Part of that tension and struggle always involved his personal relationships, for he had a genius for friendship, but an equal sensitivity which involved the agony of loss. Given his temperament and background the loss of friends, lovers, parents was a torture patterned into an attitude toward suffering that saw it as part of the educational process of God, the righteous Judge, who was yet loving Father, a fact which posed another puzzle, another unresolved tension

XUM

in his own role as spiritual father and judge of his flock.

He not only wept over Dido, but actually and most bitterly over his lost loves: his friend in Thagaste:

> My soul could do nothing without him . . . we depended too much upon each other (Conf. 4.6).

His reactions to losses were typically violent:

> My heart was utterly overclouded; whatsoever I cast mine eyes upon, looked like death to me . . . I hated all places for they had not him . . . I became a great riddle to myself and I often asked over my soul why she was so sad. . . but she knew not what to answer . . . only tears were sweet to me . . . so much the more did I hate and fear (as my cruelest enemy) death . . . and I imagined it would speedily make an end of all other men because it had the power to do so to him (Conf. IV. vi).

His mother's death produced the same agony: "I closed her eyes, and there flowed withal an unspeakable sorrow into my heart, which overflowed into tears, mine eyes at the same time by the violent command of my mind, pumped their well dry, and woe was me in that same agony... what did grievously pain me within... a wound newly taken by having that most sweet and dear custom of living with her suddenly broken off ... so was my soul wounded, yes, my life torn in pieces which had been made one out of hers and mine together" (Conf. 9.12). Characteristically, ten years later, he sees God's permitting him to experience this unrelieved pain as pedagogical action: "impressing upon my memory by this one experiment, how strong is the bond of all custom..." a conviction which will grow

XUM

ever stronger with the growth of his years.

For five agonizing years, from the loss of his concubine in 385, through the death of Monnica in 387, to the deaths of Adeodatus, his son, and Nebridius, his close friend, probably, in 390, Augustine experienced the searing pain of loss, so much so that he could write: "Let us put off all empty tasks and assume useful ones. As for exemption from care, I do not think that any can be hoped for in this world" (Ep.18). Piece by piece his protecting armour was stripped from him.

By 391, he arrived in Hippo in search of a spot to found a monastery, to find solace for grief in active service, but, above all, in communion with the brethren. This young man, at 36, had lived many lives: Manichee, skeptic, Neoplatonist, Christian convert, and now, suddenly he was "grabbed," (Serm. 355.2); Valerius's shouting flock pushed him forward and forced him to agree to be their priest (Vita. IV.2). Characteristically, he wept; his God had grabbed him by the hair....violently.

Within this same period Augustine will experience not only the violent measures of the Donatist Circumcellions, but also, the attacks of their intellectual militia, the Donatist bishops and clergy who bring theological and biblical arguments against his positions. From his first anti-Donatist work, the Psalmus abecedarius, or Psalmus contra Partem Donati (394) to his last in that line, the

Contra Gaudentium Donatistarum Episcopum (420), he spent some thirty years in constant controversy with the schismatics. For the Neoplatonic philosopher of Cassicacum to enter the lists singing was a change, indeed! In verse, but not a work of poetry by any means, the Psalmus serves its writer's apologetic purpose: to instruct his congregation about the facts, in order to memorize them and answer their Donatist neighbors who subjected them to both physical and intellectual forms of persuasion: "...I wrote a psalm for them to sing, going through the Latin alphabet to the letter "V"...adding an epilogue, as though their Mother the Church were addressing them." (Retrac.i.19) -- a very significant analogy in the light of his motivations and his growing theological concept of what Church meant for him and Africans.[27]

But popularization (shades of Ambrose!) was only one small phase of the battle. He had to meet the intellectuals on their own ground. Before his consecration in 395, he tried to approach them through tempered argument, without acrimony or strife, but after that date, his wide range of activity brought reprisal and attacks upon his very person, even the threat of assassination (Poss. Vita. Aug.12). During the revolt of Gildo he wrote the De agone Christiano naming the Donatists as heretics, and in 400, he produced a major dogmatic work, his three books Contra Epistulam Parmeniani (400), defending Tyconius and Caecilian. That

XUM

raised the question of Baptism which he addressed in the De Baptismo contra Donatistas, sometimes considered his greatest anti-Donatist work. He argues for Baptism validly administered by those outside the Church, but without spiritual good for the individual until he returns to the Catholic Church. These major works were part of a corpus which included his epistles, some of them practically treatises, plus sermons full of exhortation to the flock against the schismatics.

Most significantly, about 399, the laws against heretics began to be applied against the Donatists; they were now within the range of the imperial arm (C.Parm.I.12.19). Worse, they were even summoned by the secular authority to a conference with the Catholics (Gest.Coll.Carth.xi.1201-2), an abomination to the Donatists who considered such a summons a profanation of their religious status. Meanwhile, Augustine produced his third major work against them: three books: the Contra Litteras Petiliani, in answer to the latter's attack on the Catholics in 400. Between the third and fourth books Augustine published, however, the De unitate Ecclesiae (or it came from the hands of one of his clergy in Hippo) which provoked a reply from Petilian, to which Augustine responded in the third book against him. Cresconius, the grammarian, defended Petilian, and Augustine's rejoinder came in 405/406: his last great work against the Donatists, the Contra Cresconium grammaticum.

A test-case, meanwhile, had placed the Donatists firmly

in the category of heretics before the law; the stage was set for a confrontation in the theological arena as well, but first, the Ninth Council of Carthage in 404 asked the state to help repress the Donatists, but they were anticipated (Ep.88.7). The court, convinced more by the scars of Maximian of Bagai, perhaps, than by Catholic rhetoric, agreed, (C.Cres. III.43.47).

In spite of the fall of Stilicho which gave the Donatists new hopes, Augustine and his friends procured a new crop of anti-Donatist laws from Honorius in 408; and 409 saw further decrees which were enforced by Donatus, African proconsul.[28] All this in Africa while Alaric pushed Attalus into power, and Africa was again the pawn in the imperial chess game, but Heraclian held it for Honorius and the latter remitted taxation for Africans in arrears and released bans on the heretics to some extent. The Catholics quickly appealed, and Honorius on 25 August, 410 acceded with an order of real severity against the heretics (Cod. Theod. XVI.v.51)... and this was the day after the Sack of Rome![29] More important, still, Honorius sent Count Marcellinus to Africa to convoke and preside over a conference to settle the schism, the famed Collatio at Carthage of May-June, 411, which finally decided in favor of the Catholics. Fines were set up; Donatism was proscribed as of 30 January, 412 (Cod. Theod. XVI.v.52). But Augustine's work went on.

About this time he wrote the De Unico Baptismo contra

Petilianum defending the validity of baptism in spite of the sinful minister, which appeared in 410, and many letters, especially, the notable Epistle to Vincentius of Cartenna in 408 (Ep.93). The end of the Collatio gave him the heavy task of propagating its decisions, and he wrote a summary the Breviculus Collationis in 411 and the Ad Donatistas post Collationem in 412, a much more detailed work.

Then suddenly, as so often in his life, the scene changed with violent repercussions: Heraclian set out for Italy to bid for imperial power! Repulsed, he returned to Africa, was arrested at Carthage and beheaded. Worse still, Augustine's friend, Marcellinus, was somehow involved in his disgrace and was arrested and beheaded on 13 September, 413 (Ep.151.6). Some rumor of Donatist revenge as motivation exists but no definitive answer is available. Most significantly, this reversal of fortune, so often a part of his lifestory, so soon after the triumph of 411 in the same city, left Augustine confused, wounded, and defeated. He had failed to secure the amnesty he sought for his friend, an amnesty which he had secured for so many others. The alliance of church and state was no alliance at all. He went home to Hippo resolved to spend his time in ecclesiastical affairs and his books (Ep.151.13).

Yet, the pastoral pressure never ceased. He published his last anti-Donatist work, the Contra Gaudentium, which defended the use of the imperial arm to coerce obedience in

spiritual affairs! And a new controversy had sprung up with the entrance of Pelagius into the African scene in 411 when Augustine wrote his first book against him, the De peccatorum meritis et remissione. This controversy would challenge his best efforts, given the intellectual calibre of his opponent.

But, as always, his pastoral work continued to give motivation for the theological works. He began the De civitate Dei in 413. The first three books were written before the death of Marcellinus; the whole work took thirteen years to complete. Seventeen books were written by 420, the end of his struggle with the Donatists.

Along with the chief Donatist pieces, then, went such theological works in these amazing thirty years (390-420), works which help us ascertain the evolution of Augustine's attitude toward Romanitas, perhaps, much more accurately than those which treat directly of the state and its powers as found in the controversy. What concerns us here is the evolution of certain ideas and attitudes which would finally shape his over-all characteristic stance toward the classical mystique.

Chief among these will be his idea of man, of society, of Rome and its destiny, its role and its powers, and finally, his concept of the Church. The pressure of external events, chief among these, pastoral demands, acting upon his interior motivations, so meld with and condition the latter that an evolution takes place in his attitudes towards his own civili-

zation: his classical mould, an evolution entirely logical from his point of view. This entire process is the history of his personal and social change in a world rapidly changing under him. His response is a rich blend of reaction, accommodation, conformity and utter non-conformity, typical of the sharp dualities of his personal philosophy and theology.

To trace the course of this evolution, we must step back for perspective and pick up strands indicated earlier (Ch. I. *supra*). Augustine's story has been called a "quest of wisdom,"[30] and rightly so, for to Augustine, philosophy was simply that, and its aim: man's happiness. For ages, by his day, man had pursued that happiness as he struggled to find answers to the good, true, beautiful, and eternal. Augustine was not exempt from that struggle, but his struggle took place in a germinal time of world-struggle, and his personal answers, whether he knew it or not, became part of the total answers of his time: the man and the age came together in the thrust to the future, for the man carried the story of the age in his own heart. He had been *magna pars* in the struggle: provincial, classicist, rhetor, Manichee, Skeptic, Neoplatonist, catechumen, priest, bishop, judge, patriarch, theologian -- all those lives in this one frail man.

As we noted, progress in any of the four areas mentioned above usually occurs when the meaning of one of the questions changed, i.e., its content. Christianity produced a revolutionary change in society by changing the approach to the

questions of the good and the eternal, of ethics and religion. And it was as a religion that Augustine believed in and practiced Christianity. Ethics was an empty concept without religion. All life was theological. All history was moral history.

We have seen Romanitas as a culture in search of a religion. Christianity, in the fourth century, was a religion in search of a culture, for the culture of that era stood condemned and found wanting. Yet, to be true to itself, as Augustine learned so painfully, Christianity as a higher religion could never become identified with any culture. Always between Christianity and culture stood the Cross. Because of its spiritual claim, Christianity always involved a certain dualism, for the relationship of religion and culture was simply the social corollary of the relationship between faith and Life.[31]

Augustine's own approach to Romanitas was part of his Weltanschauung, his worldview, and concept of reality. He did not try to write a philosophy of history; certainly, his De civitate Dei is none such. Rather, he saw in history the working out of universal principles over which he spent many hours of meditation. These Christian principles contain his theory of human nature: his own anthropology and psychology, deduced from his theology of creation and grace, the fruit of his reflection upon God's revelation in Sacred Scripture. Not a rational theory, for it is based upon and ends in

revealed dogma, it is yet rational in its logical method, and it involves a rational theory of the nature of society and law and of the relation of social life to ethics.[32]

At this point, Augustine breaks through the philosophic and religious dilemmas of classical civilization, and unites in his thinking the two outstanding traditions of the Graeco-Roman world: the Hellenic theory of society and politics, and the Christian theory of history: God had intervened in time; he had revealed his divine plan; Christ's Incarnation is the turning point in history. The Christian lived with his eyes on the future kingdom, a real one, the culmination of history, the fulfillment of man's destiny. The Church was a sign and a foretaste of that future kingdom.

Augustine did not find this unity ready to hand. Christians themselves were not of one mind about their individual or social roles. One school pushed the social dualism of Christianity in concrete form: the apocalyptic tradition so strongly exemplified in the African ecclesiastical writers: Tertullian, Cyprian, Donatus, Petilian, -- for all of these the Empire was Babylon; martyrdom leading to vindication was their goal. With Athanasius, the western bishops who had resisted Constantius believed that the essence of the Christian message was man's redemption from evil, the conquest of the sinful world, not its ultimate refinement into the likeness of God. They opposed the contemporary world and regarded as apostate the Church which sold out to the traitorous persecutor, the Empire. In

XUM

Africa this thinking had theological foundations: persecution was linked to the Christian's call to a life of union through the guidance of the Holy Spirit. The Donatists had a consistent doctrine of the Spirit and a philosophy of history dependent on it: both needed for sustaining persecution and prolonged resistance; witness the Donatist tenacity.[33]

The third century had given rise to another view of history and society, and so, another theology for Christians, fundamentally influenced, again, by environment and geography as well as local tradition: Origen's synthesis of Hellenism and Christianity which we have noted above in its cultural and educational context here appears in its theological dimensions as a theology of co-existence, a complete break with the milleniarist tradition of the kingdom-to-come on earth. It abandoned the concrete realism of Christian eschatology. Its proponents such as Origen and his followers, adopted the Greek view of history and cosmology which could hardly tolerate a realistic eschatology or the Christian apocalyptic view of history. History was not sacred. The Kingdom was a metaphysical entity in the realm of spiritual reality -- the supersensuous and intelligible world. The facts of revelation lost their uniqueness. Instead of the sacred history of man, of God's intervention in that history, we find salvation in the ascent of the soul from the earthiness of matter and its return to its heavenly home. Men are not united here, but are atomic individuals; the Church is not an objective society,

the representative of the Kingdom, but the guardian of the esoteric gnosis.[34]

Such a theory gave the Church access to the world which had embraced the mystery religions, reducing the disparity between the saeculum and the community of the faithful. It produced the basileia theology of the Byzantine world[35] uniting in the Eusebian ideal of Christian monarchy the Hellenistic theory of kingship and the Oriental tradition of sacred monarchy. In it there was no room for Christian social dualism.

Augustine's whole Christian upbringing had been in the former tradition, that of Cyprian's Church. But his philosophical search had brought him from Cicero's Hortensius, through the Manichees, through Skepticism, to the Neoplatonists and to the basilica of Ambrose who spoke to him of Basil, and so, of Origen, in his allegorical interpretation and the theology of the Greek Fathers who so often quoted the Alexandrian. This Greek aura and the fact that his first bishop in Hippo was a Greek inclined him to ask for translations of Greek commentators on Scripture from Jerome (Ep. 28.2.2).

But Hippo was not destined to become another Milan. At the very moment that Augustine would have absorbed the Eastern theological tradition it became unavailable to him. In 394 Jerome did an about-face concerning Origen. The commentaries, in any case, never arrived. The Donatists raged against him under Primian; Optatus and Gildo were in the wings. Ironically,

Augustine will turn to a Donatist for exegesis: Tyconius' "Rules," a writer African in outlook, influenced by a concept of the Church, absorbed in the dualism that lay behind the theory of the two cities.[36]

But the De civitate Dei was written to defend the Church against another foe. The Donatists were gradually handled over some thirty years. But, the Hannibal "always-at-the-gates" was the pagan whose outcries over the Sack of Rome laid the blame for the debacle at the doors of the Christians. In the years immediately before that disaster a series of laws had banished the protectors of the city, the ancient gods.

When Augustine, then, constructs his Weltanschauung out of this accumulation of motivations: Donatism, Hellenism, paganism, his Hippo congregation, his eclectic philosophy, his triumphal concept of Church, his personal faith, his fear of power and violence -- all these pushed and clamoured for recognition -- and he gave them, typically, an answer, a great narrative and a theology of history. He would bring together Hellenic political and social theory and the Christian view of history because he had already incorporated them in his daily living. He could, also, bring together two views of Church within his own Christianity for the same reason. He was a Roman who was an African, and, to my mind, an African first by this date (425): "Babylon, like a first Rome, ran its course along with the city of God which is a stranger in this world. But the things proper for insertion in this work in

XUM

comparing the two cities, that is, the earthly and heavenly, ought to be taken mostly from the Greek and Latin kingdoms, where Rome herself is like a second Babylon (CD XVIII.2.22).

So when he propounds what amounts to his statement of worldview, of history, of where man was in the early fifth century, it is in the spirit and tradition of Cyprian and Tertullian, in the rich African tradition of Christian social dualism and the eschatological expectations he found in Tyconius's "Rules." But he also brought to that statement his Greek philosophical background, and the concept of two cities in which he expressed that dualism was related to a theory of sociology;[37] above all, it was related to his concept of man: his psychology and anthropology.

First, as to his sociology: he sees all human society constituted by its common will -- a will oriented to life, pleasure, rest or peace. His Confessiones had already sounded that theme, a commonplace of Greek thought from Plato's Symposium onward: the theme of longing and satisfaction.

Man, according to this cosmology, exemplifies the forces at work in nature in general. Man, with everything else, is seen as part of a huge network of interrelated things within an ordered hierarchy of beings which together form the cosmos. In this order they are in dynamic rapport: all pursue their own ends; all come to rest only when they attain them. Their striving for rest, for satisfaction, is the motive power that drives all things to their goals, just as weight causes things

to move to their proper places. Augustine saw the forces that move men as analogous to weight and so he called them, love or loves: "Pondus meum amor meus; eo feror, quocumque feror" (Conf. XIII.9.10). "My weight is my love; by it I am carried wheresoever I am carried. . . Things a little out of their places become unquiet; put them in their order again, and they are quieted." How well he knew that unquiet, how long meditated upon it; this was his answer.

Romanitas was the bouquet, the ideology, of Graeco-Roman culture and civilization; it was the living manifestation of the classical civilization which had shaped Augustine's education and teaching. Its assumptions about Rome, its greatness, its eternity, and its destiny lived on in the educational tradition and in civic life, and these assumptions, though weakened, were still active forces in men's attitudes and behavior. They were incorporated thereby into the life of Roman society, especially, wherever Latin civilization had taken root. Given Augustine's approach above, how did he see society in general, and his own in particular: the turbulent Later Empire of Theodosius and Honorius?

Augustine's sociology saw society constituted by its common will to achieve the objects of its love. United by a common agreement, then, this group of rational creatures pursued their goal together. If this object is good, so is the society, and vice versa. The moral law in individual and social life, then, is the same; men are drawn on by good or

bad loves. Hence comes the distinction and the nature of the two cities: from the natures of their wills, their loves. This is the principle I mentioned (Preface) which brought together Augustine's philosophy and theology coming to rest in this theme as explanation of both human nature and human society, and, consequently, of Romanitas which had evolved from the Greek concepts of paideia and philanthropia. Classical civilization had subscribed to the cult of power and surrendered itself thereby to the virtus et fortuna of the demagogue as the answer to social organization, peaceful civic order in which to pursue happiness. Men's differences sprang from the sort of peace and happiness they pursued; man could choose his love. Here Augustine found the basis of the dualism he experienced: the desire for earthly happiness of the earthly man and the desire for spiritual happiness of the heavenly man. Most simply, he says: "Two loves have built two Cities -- the earthly, which is built up by the love of self to the contempt of God, and the heavenly, which is built up by the love of God to the contempt of self" (CD XIV.28).

Out of this simple division of men and societies comes Augustine's view of history, the story of the two societies, for the two cities had existed since Cain and Abel and will so continue. In Books XV to XVIII Augustine narrates this story of world history, and finds it a long trail of injustice, bloodshed, violence. Nor does he participate in the Eusebian enthusiasm for the Empire's history wherein "the wider extension

of her empire produced still greater wars. . ." (CD XIX.7).

At this point we need to trace the evolution of Augustine's attitude toward history. Before 393 he tries to harmonize, as we noted above, two systems of thought, the Platonist and the Christian, and to this date, the former predominates in his treatment.[38] Yet, in the De vera religione (389), we have a civitas terrena and a regnum caelorum, not yet a civitas dei, for Augustine here combines a Jewish-Christian theory of God's gradual dealing with man with the Graeco-Roman view of man's gradual ascent from the sensible to the intelligible world. He sees history in terms of human progress. God is the Paedogogus of the human race. What is happening here is the beginning of the challenge his study of Scripture evokes. No wonder he turns to Jerome for commentaries, and commentaries from the Greeks! In one sense, it would have made no difference if he had received them in regard to this one question, for the Platonic position can afford to bypass history since man struggles in a timeless ascent to the intelligible world, while the Scriptural mode calls for justifying the ways of God to man in time in both the Old and the New Testaments.[39]

But, with his answer to Simplicianus,[40] a change occurs, for, in 394, he is lecturing on Romans in Carthage and writing on Galatians[41] -- the immediate reason, perhaps, for his need of commentators, but the biblical writings are part of his search for a solution to the question of God's providence in man's history, and so, he turns to Paul, for, in the face of

XUM

his changing position on sin and grace his organizing principle: history as universal progress, will no longer work.

Paul's total reliance on God's power, his total acceptance of his own weakness and inability to merit salvation seems to be Augustine's solution, especially, his view of the relationship of Christianity and Jewish Law. He can no longer subscribe to the De vera religione in its lack of emphasis on grace; evil and man's impotence to save himself do not square with inevitable progress.

In the Expositio. . .ad Romanos, he introduces human history in two divisions: the Jews under the law and the Christians under grace. The Ad Simplicianum expresses for the first time Augustine's mature views on the nature of grace[42] with consequent repercussions on his view of history and society. It is interesting that at this very time he is working on the first three books of the De Doctrina Christiana and, in 397, he begins the Confessiones in which he expresses in prayer-form his findings in Scripture and in his own experience of the validity for him of Paul's conclusions.

But, gradually, his love for sharp distinctions grows, his rhetorical tendency to juxtapose opposites, making more of the contrast of the sinner and the saved; gradual stages no longer lead to salvation. The Old Testament also becomes the law of Christ, and not a stage, and the Jews are now the same as the heathen; nor is theirs a stage on the road of progress (Exp. prop. Rom. 52). The Ad Simplicianum insists that God chooses

the elect as those he knows he has determined; these are the justified.[43] This position leads to a new meaning for history, for in it, "all men are sinners, a mass of sin (massa peccati.)." Every child born from this blasted root has original sin; death and misery, then, are the fate of every being born of such parents as Adam who "subjected their descendants to the punishment of sin and damnation, for he had radically corrupted them, in himself, by his sinning. . . so all descended from him . . . entered into the inheritance of original sin."[45]

Using Ecclesiasticus, Augustine sees God as cursing some men, blessing others. He felt that this passage was "most necessary for the problem we are considering and confirms what has just been discussed" (Simpl. 1.2.20). True, the passage shows God exalting and dashing down, but I cannot help but suspect that Augustine was attracted to the passage, not only because it elucidated his thesis, but also because it is an excellent example of the use of Latin rhetorical devices for securing emphasis such as chiasmus and juxtaposition of opposites plus what we might call a "semantic onomatopeia," wherein the words and the passage itself mirror the meaning: "Contrarium malo bonum est, et contra mortem vita est; sic et contra virum justum peccator. Et sic intuere in omnia opera altissimi: duo, duo; unum contra unum." (Ecc.33.13ff). In other words, the passage in style and meaning, reflects in its dualistic form the very dualism Augustine's theology sought to expound: "The Lord distinguished them and appointed their different ways;

XUM

some of them he blessed and exalted; some, he made holy and brought near to himself; some he cursed and brought low . . . as clay in the hand of the potter (Cf. Rom. 9.21). . . so men are in the hand of him who made them, to give them as he decides. Good is the opposite of evil, and life the opposite of death; so the sinner is the opposite of the godly" (Sirach 33.11-15). But, the last verses are the most telling: "Look upon the works of the Most High; they are also in pairs, one the opposite of the other." The English is pale here. The Latin pounds the contrast: "duo, duo; unum contra unum." -- a figure bound to catch the eye and ear of a rhetor -- as well as, finally, -- his heart.

In his reflection upon Ecclesiasticus as found in the Ad Simplicianum Augustine finds answers to his questions on history and grace, combining his biblical studies with his philosophical basis. Man is in disorder. That disorder is sin, but justice is still an image of God's justice. Yet, sinful man cannot accept this image; he needs God's grace. Man is not sufficient unto himself, nor can he comprehend the universe unaided. Augustine finds himself, by 396, accepting this ambiguous state: "He . . . had disposed all things in number and weight and measure (Wis.11.21), but inscrutable are his judgments: unsearchable his ways" (Rom.11.33). Ben Sira and Paul had triumphed.[46]

In 397, Augustine divides his Confessiones into two sections recounting how God has "disposed all things": first

(I-X), with Augustine, himself, and second (XI-XIII), with all men -- two ways in which God had acted in his Providence with man. But, it was the God of Abraham that Augustine still longed to bring together with the God of Plato and Plotinus, and the Confessions is that attempt. Here he tries truly to do a Confessio, a praise of God and an accusation of himself, for he now knew that confession of guilt: his oneness with all the massa damnati, and abandonment of self-sufficiency were the two requisites for attaining wisdom, for being healed by God's mercy and love.

Here begins his real opposition to Pelagius: conversion to Christianity did not mean final righteousness, utter justification, the cutting of all bridges to the past. Man was a creature of custom, vis consuetudinis, the activity of human memory strengthened and confirmed by that very action the power of habit unto compulsion (de Mus. VI.5.15).

Augustine's amazing ability to take nothing for granted in studying his own experience had led him to analyze his own heart so thoroughly that he now knew he could never plumb its depths with its unsearchable ways, hidden attitudes and urges (Conf. X.37.62). His keen intellect, his long search for truth, his frequent disappointments in that journey, his refusal to accept the obvious explanation of his experience -- all of these found expression in the unforgettable tenth book. For he had listened to his own heart, he had known what it was to be pulled around in front of himself so that he had to

look at himself (Conf. VIII.7):

> ...whereas I had no desire to look at myself, and thou didst set me before my own face that I might see how filthy, how crooked...I was. I went not into thy will and covenant, my God, for that way we go not in ships, nor chariots, nor upon our own legs, no, not so small a part of the way to it...but to arrive...required no more but the will to go to it. . . not to stagger and stumble with a half-wounded will."

That great scene in Book VIII is the insight reached in the Ad Simplicianum now in the form of a philosopher's prayer, a philosopher who knew how to use the Neoplatonic theory of the workings of the soul to understand his own experience.

But, above all, this excerpt from Book VIII sounds again and again the intellectual conclusion of Simplicianum: God chooses those whom He justifies; wills are chosen and confirmed. Book XIII chimes the return to the dualism of "two classes of men"; using Genesis, Augustine sees a sea of sinners and a land of the just, but here more clearly in regard to their relationship to God by grace, their destination is still the heavenly society, not an intelligible world; all men are involved in time.

Twenty years later in the Civitate, he will declare that there can be no return; what is begun in time is consummated in eternity (CD XII.11-20). Time is no perpetually revolving image of eternity; it is an irreversible process moving in a definite direction. Origen's theory gave no finality to the temporal process,[47] and thereby destroyed the organic unity of

mankind and the meaning of his social destinies. Augustine explodes these perpetual cycles and Origen's interpretation as well; the "Neoplatonist" theologian parts company with both the Hellenistic school of philosophy and one tradition of Christian life in his time. The spiritual Christian, for Augustine, draws his spiritual values from the Scriptures, the new corpus classicum, the new renowned auctores; they are God's word to him in time; God's Word, Christ, is the way the mind escapes the maze of pagan thought (CD XII.20).

Still more, Augustine, in the Confessiones, is reiterating his psychological discovery concerning "delight" -- the only mover of the will, the only root of man's action and behavior: he must be touched by an object of delight; feeling aids intellect (Ad Simp. I; 2.13). Here he came face to face with the realm of the unconscious, the uncontrollable, the parts of him, the processes, of which he knew not. God's inspiration would be granted the will to choose what would move us to delight in order to go toward Him. The Confessiones are part of this same struggle to analyze his feelings in the process of analyzing his own puzzling human motivations: how is the will moved to act? The will is moved by delight, it moves toward a loved object as the result of the working together of intellect and feeling: mysterious processes in which God's action helps the heart to good (Conf. VI.5.7).

His clearest expression of history (before the CD) as contrast between the two societies we find, however, in Augustine's

De catechizandis rudibus (399) and they now emerge as "two cities, one of the wicked and the other of the holy. . .from the beginning of the human race even to the end of time. . . separated in body also on the day of judgment." (cat. rud. 19.31). In the De doctrina (397), Augustine had made Christ both Fatherland and Way, he now makes of angels and Christians here one society, through faith forming one city. This places the Jews outside the city of God (cat. rud. 19.33). Monarchy, earthly power, power and rule, are merely neutral in face of the striking contrast of the two cities.

The period from 395 to c.401, then, sketched above, was one of unbelievable literary activity for the new bishop of Hippo, the time of Gildo and Optatus of Thamugadi. The works cited above: the De vera religione, Ad Simplicianum, Confessiones, De doctrina, De catechizandis, plus the Contra Faustum Manichaeum (397), and the beginnings of the De Trinitate, along with the 1st three of his four major anti-Donatist works -- all of these fell within this period and throw light on the process of evolution of Augustine's attitude toward history, society, and man in various ways. As the Donatist controversy and the Circumcellion violence increased, these three germinal notions were bombarded with new data from Augustine's experiences as bishop and theologian, as we have seen above in noting further Donatist writings of Augustine, and in his triumph at the Conference of Carthage in 411.

Between 401 and 414 Augustine wrote another work which

XUM

gives us his most penetrating analysis of the ultimate theological grounds for the distinction we now need to consider as part of his view of history: what he meant by "sacred" and "secular" history: the great commentary on the first chapters of Genesis: how does God act in time? To do so, let us see what he meant by "prophecy" which he often contrasts with "history." (De vera rel. 25.46): God's will for man is disclosed through history and through prophecy, known through faith; Augustine uses history to refer to the past, prophecy to the future.

But he is on the way, soon, to saying that the Bible is simultaneously historic and prophetical. By the time he writes the Civitate, indeed, he will call the Bible prophetica historia, making the two terms one (CD XVI.2.3). He feels that the essential activity of prophecy is the prophetic judgment on the meaning of experience, achieved through divine help or illumination just as the mind knows (in his theory of illumination) in general (CD XI.3). Insight thus imparted will show the prophet the hidden meaning of events within God's plan, so his narrative is historical in form and prophetic in the manner in which the meaning of the historical narrative is displayed. It will be what he calls: prophetica, or sacra historia. Its prophetic quality is what distinguishes it from ordinary history.[48]

Sacred history, then, is what is in the Sacred Canon, divinely inspired, transcending the perspective of the secular historian. All other history even when it speaks of the story

of salvation, is secular, or extra-biblical. Only sacred history furnishes clues to what God has really done. From this it follows that the turning points in sacred history are the real turning points in human history; they are the fixed points in universal history, e.g., his six ages of history are from the Biblical narrative. Both the structure and the meaning of history come from sacred history.

Since the coming of Christ until the end of time, all history is the same: one cannot chart it from the terms of sacred history, however, for the significant turning point is over. His own time was the "old age" of the world. His view of history is based upon his theological conviction that the center of history, the central happening is the Incarnation. The implications of this idea for an "sacralization" of the Roman Empire are obvious; even its very recent "Christian" period is only a part of the blank, as it were; the period after Christ is one long, homogeneous period until the second coming.

This view of history allows Augustine to combat with theological argument the current "ancestor-worship" of his pagan contemporaries and fellow-intellectuals: Symmachus, Volusianus, and his like who fed upon the Roman past; that glorified past, in this context, had no special sacred character; it was part of the "last times." Thus, he could confront not only the <u>laudator temporis acti</u>, his pagan confreres, but also, the century-old tradition in the Church: the Eusebian,

XUM

founded upon the theological views of Clement and Origen, voiced so often by Ambrose, Prudentius, and Orosius. But before he could arrive at this final position, he, too, seemed to share their euphoria as he saw the pagan collapse and the Christian triumph. From these very years of the 390's till about the death of Marcellinus (413), he had, in the Contra Faustum, especially (13.7), seen that triumph as God's fulfillment of prophecy: "All the kings of the earth shall adore Him, and all nations shall serve Him" (Ps. 72.10). Again, in the De catechizandis we find this euphoric picture of the success of the Church and its victory as part of God's plan for salvation.

This interim period of optimistic interpretation of the relationship of the Christian Church and the pagan Empire as co-partners in God's saving action sprang, as ever, from the external events of his experience in his African milieu; in spite of the Donatist pressures Gildo was crushed in 398; and as we have seen, the Empire sent officials to wipe out even the physical remains of paganism (399 ff). Theodosius's victory over the forces of the neo-pagan revival at the Frigidus was a beautiful allegorical figure of the world-wide defeat of their forces in the minds and hearts of men, and by 411, Augustine's own forces overcame the internal disturbers of the oneness of the Ecclesia Mater: the Donatists. Until 413, hope grew green in the new bishop's heart.

This optimism, however, began to fade with the news of

the Sack of Rome and Augustine must begin in his own Hippo to explicate this disaster for his congregation. Why did God permit this to happen when the Church had triumphed and all men were becoming Christian? In reply, he not only denies Rome's eternal perdurance, thereby refuting the pagan belief in that myth, but he also denies that the Empire is a Christian society which can fulfill for Christians the goal of life: conversio! (Sermo 105.6.8.10, etc.), and in Epistle 199, Augustine tells Hesychius that the times in which they live (418) are part of the neutral period, the last days, only to end with the Second Coming.

Nor is the Empire the instrument of God in christianizing the nations, but, rather, it may be a severe trial and temptation to the spiritual renewal which is Augustine's first concern (De perf. ius. 15.35). Markus devotes an enlightening chapter to this idea of interpreting the Theodosian-Honorian period as tempora christiana, and notes that by about 414 Augustine had almost completed his mature view of sacred and profane history. His idea of prophetic inspiration is seen in Book XII of his Genesis commentary[49] and also appears in the De civitate Dei in his view of history in the later books.

What emerges for Augustine is a view of sacred history as that found within Sacred Scripture; all else is secular, and from this thinking comes his mature position about the Roman Empire, Christian or otherwise. The Sack of Rome precipitated this change in Augustine, but I see, also, the

unbelievable execution of Marcellinus as a final contributory factor to cement the attitudes appearing in the Civitate from Book IV on, written after his friend's execution.

We have seen the dualism of the two kinds of men in Augustine's thought, then, from his earliest thinking on man's history, e.g., the De vera religione (27.50). But the Sack of Rome, the death of Marcellinus, and the intellectual challenge flung at him from outraged pagans had by 413 gradually centered that dualistic approach into an identification of Rome and its Empire as the earthly embodiment of the civitas terrena, Babylon revisited.

During the time Augustine writes the De civitate Dei the Donatist settlement is still with him; he helps propagate the decrees of the Collatio -- and of the Empire -- as he implements both the decisions of the bishops in council and the imperial officials at court. But, also with him is the pain, the confusion, the feeling of impotence to effect justice, the need to answer critics of his Church -- and Honorius was no Theodosius; short was the Roman myth of a "Christian times." His view of history and society had disposed of that approach, but now, how to apply what he had worked out theologically in that connection to the present historical society of his ambience, the Roman Empire? For that story we need to look at the second part of the Civitate. Still more, we must consider Augustine's concept of "Church." These items constitute the subject-matter of Chapter V.

CHAPTER V

In conspectu aeternitatis

In Chapter IV I tried to present some components of the impact made on Augustine through his experience of what it was to be bishop and judge, philosopher and theologian, friend and foe from 390 to 420 in Africa. In Chapter V, I shall try to show how the overarching concept of Church became the theological lodestar to condition his attitudes toward Romanitas, its Empire, its Emperor, and the use of imperial power in regulating the internal affairs of that Church. That concept developed from his pastoral experience, indeed, but also from the ever-deepening motivation of his expectations. He had turned his face to the setting sun. In 414 he would be sixty years old. Already, in 396, at forty-two, in the Ad Simplicianum he had reached his mature view of grace. In answering Simplicianus, Augustine had applied his own unswerving dialectical method and had arrived at an answer to his friend's question: why was it that God had said "I have hated Esau?" In so doing, he had attained a tightly-knit consistent synthesis of his ideas on predestination, grace, and free-will. He himself, describes his dilemma:

> In the solution of this question, I, indeed, labored in defense of the free choice of the human will, but the grace of God conquered, and, finally I was able to understand, with full clarity, the meaning of the Apostle: "For who singles thee out? Or what has thou that thou has not received? And if thou hast received it, why dost thou boast as if thou hadst

> not received it?" Cyprian, the martyr, too, wishing to show this, embraced all this under the heading: "We should glory in nothing since we have nothing in which to glory." (Retract.2.27).

Finally he saw himself and all men as utterly dependent on God, even for the first impulse of receiving Him in faith: "It is God who works in you, both that you should wish and act with a good will." (Ad Simp. I.2.12). Significantly, Augustine seems to have held this view of grace contained in the first book of the Ad Simplicianum, his commentary on Paul (Romans) and Kings, to the end of his life. As late as 428/29 in his work on the Predestination of the Saints, he repeats his views from the Ad Simplicianum and recommends that the brethren read it. Surely, the Retractations contain no change or correction. In the pastoral exigency of answering his friend's puzzled question, he developed what would prove to be the theological keystone of his views on man, society, state, Empire, Romanitas and Church. For it was as a churchman that he thought, struggled, wrote, worked and prayed.

Gradually, in these thirty years, Augustine had become fully "a churchman," the leader of a band of African bishops, often his own former companions, his trainees. Step by step, he had become identified with his office as bishop, chief-pastor to his people, an office which involved adjudication, judgment, decision. Soon, given the punitive laws of Theodosius and his sons, he will have to intervene with the right

of intercessio to save from the extreme penalty those who come within the ambit of such laws: Donatists, officials, friends or foe.

And sometimes he failed. Marcellinus he could not save. All the more significant the dedication of the De civitate Dei written to keep his promise to his friend: "to defend the glorious City of God against those who prefer their own gods to its Founder." But he feels this task will be a difficult one, indeed, since he knows "that ingenuity and force of argument are needed to convince proud men of the power of humility," God's free gift, for "God resists the proud and gives grace to the humble (Preface). Unfortunately, the swollen spirit of human pride claims for itself this high prerogative which belongs to God alone, and longs and loves to hear repeated in its own praise: 'To be merciful to the conquered and to beat the haughty down (Vergil, Aen. 6.853).'" He then proceeds to treat of the Earthly City which "lusts to dominate the world and which, though nations bend to its yoke, is itself dominated by its passion for dominion (CD I. Pref).

Here, in a fascinating juxtaposition, the rhetor-bishop sets up the polarities. He uses the mightiest line from Rome's greatest poet of Empire, as Vergil proclaims Rome's mission to the nations parcere subiectis et debellare superbos. In sharpest contrast comes the Scriptural word: "God resists the proud and gives grace to the humble (James.4.6)." Not only will Augustine delineate the cities, he, also, states their over-

riding theme, philosophy, and the secret of membership: God gives his grace; men are members of the City of God because he has predestined them to beatitude with Him (CD 15.1).

And the two cities are distinguished by the loves of their inhabitants (CD 14.1). Tell me what a people loves, he says, and I shall tell you what it is (CD 19.24). Back to his basic principle, he sees the will as the great indicator: a man is moved by his love, so people are united into a city by agreement on the object of their loves. But, he insists, only the true society, the true city whose King is Christ is made up of those predestined to be happy eternally with God in heaven.

And here we meet the fifth factor influencing Augustine's over-all approach to Romanitas: his expectations; he strove to live in Christian hope. We have seen in preceding chapters the motivations of culture, education, environment, and experience shaping his theology and his actions. In this last Chapter we note the all-pervasive influence of his expectations on these two factors. In the Preface to the De civitate Dei, he sees the city of the righteous, those so destined by God as living now by faith, but in hope of the city of God which one day he trusts he will see "in the fixed stability of its eternal seat. . .when it will obtain by virtue of its excellence final victory and perfect peace." His expectations include those of the Creed: "The Holy Ghost, the Holy Catholic Church, the Communion of Saints, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection

of the body and life everlasting." To all of this Augustine clung by faith. He had experienced faith as a great gift in the moment of his conversion when his will was suddenly fortified -- and how else but by God's loving act? Therefore, he clung firmly to Christ as Mediator:

> Since He is man, for by His humanity He shows us that, in order to obtain that blessed and beatific good, we need not seek other mediators to lead us through the successive steps of this attainment, but that the blessed and beatific God, having himself become a partaker of our humanity, has afforded us ready access to the participation of his divinity. For in delivering us from our mortality and misery, He does not lead us to the immortal and blessed angels, so that we should become immortal and blessed by participating in their nature, but he leads us straight to that Trinity, by participating in which the angels themselves are blessed. Therefore, when He chose to be in the form of a servant, and lower than the angels, that he might be our Mediator, He remained higher than the angels in the form of God -- Himself at once the way of life on earth and life itself in heaven. (CD 9.15)

This emphasis on Christ as Mediator recalls Augustine's answer to the classical maze of pagan thought exemplified in Romanitas. In repudiating the eternal, ceaseless revolution of cycles as our future state of blessedness, Augustine declares such an idea false

> by the loud testimony of religion and truth: for religion truthfully promises a true blessedness, of which we shall be eternally assured and which cannot be interrupted by any disaster. Let us therefore keep to the straight path which is Christ, and with Him as Guide and Saviour let us turn away in heart and mind from the unreal futile cycles of the godless. Porphyry, Platonist though he was, abjured the opinion of his school, that in these cycles souls are ceaselessly passing away and returning

> -- either struck by the extravagance of the idea or sobered by his knowledge of Christianity. As I mentioned in the 10th Book (30), he preferred saying that the soul as it had been sent into the world that it might know evil and be purged and delivered from it, was never again exposed to such an experience after it had once returned to the Father (CD 12.20).

A coming-together of the contents of his expectations of eternal life. He is able to break out of the philosophical trap of hopeless cycles through the promise confirmed for him by religion and truth: an eternal assurance; no disaster can ever interrupt it again, "never again," for Christ, the straight path, Guide and Saviour, has delivered him who had known evil and been purged from it through Him. And so, he returns to the Father -- this last a beautiful personalizing of his concept of eternal blessedness. The whole passage breathes the longing, the hope, of the man who has suffered many a disaster, many a loss of any assurance, many a winding path of falsehood; he has known evil, been purged and delivered, and now his eyes were on the eternal hills: the return to the Father. In the light of these expectations, I see his worldview, including his view of Romanitas coming full-circle: in conspectu aeternitatis, in the light of eternity, and that light is a profoundly neutralizing agent.

When he looked into the face of the Father as Augustine turned toward eternity, and then into His Word to him in time: the Sacred Scriptures, which described for him the life and the way of Christ, the Son, the aging bishop now had a firm basis

XUM

from which to make judgments, decisions, to take up attitudes, and to initiate behavior. Out of his theology of creation and grace, out of his eschatology, came his views and his attitudes toward Romanitas and his world.

We have seen in Chapter IV Augustine's approach to the Scriptures as prophetica historia (CD VI.2), distinguishing them from ordinary history through their prophetic quality which revealed the meaning of the historical narrative. What this distinction did to all other history, of course, was to make it neutral; Augustine's theology told him that the central point of all history, the Incarnation, had come and gone; now all history was homogeneous; it can have no more turning-points meaningful for sacred history. He was now in the "age of the Church" the age of spreading the Gospel, the age of man's reformation.[1]

Augustine's view of sacred history not only neutralized his view of all history, but certainly, his view of the glorified past of Rome; he could no longer permit the sacralization of the Roman Empire he had experienced in the euphoria of the Theodosian period of imperium Christianum, a real period of the history of salvation, that of the Christian Empire. That view of his own times had helped him to make use of that Christian Imperial arm to quell heresy and schism; heretics could be compelled to come in (Ep. 185.5-19). Witness his behavior in the Donatist controversy.

However, after 410 (Sack of Rome) and 413 (death of

Marcellinus), an idea like tempora Christiana is repugnant and explosive. By about 414, he had become convinced of his theology of the prophetic inspiration of the scriptures and their sole identification as sacred history. This theological approach allowed him to resolve the dilemma posed by the idea of a triumphant Christian times. He also utilized for this purpose other ideas already present in his writings, especially, that of his concept of man as the massa peccati of the Ad Simplicianum (I.2.16). Man, through Adam, is in disorder which is sin. He is helpless without grace, and God gives that grace, but he chooses those whom He justifies (Conf.8). So there are two classes of men (Conf. XIII). By the time he writes Book XII of the De civitate Dei, some twenty years later, Augustine adds,

> that in the first man there was laid the foundation . . .in God's foreknowledge of these two cities or societies, so far as regards the human race. For from him all men were to be derived -- some of them to be associated with the good angels in their reward, others with the wicked in punishment; all being ordered by the secret yet just judgment of God. For since it is written, "All the paths of the Lord are mercy and truth," neither can His grace be unjust nor his justice cruel (CD XII.27).

We see a metamorphosis of Augustine's ideas on man, society, and history from the Ad Simplicianum, through his statement of the plan of the two cities in the eleventh book of his Genesis commentary (De Gen. ad litt. XI.15.20), on into the first three books of the De civitate Dei (to 413). One cannot easily ascribe its cause to the predominant influence

of Rome in his thoughts. Not only the Sack of Rome with its embarrassing theological questions, but also, his traumatic experience at the execution of Marcellinus suddenly caused Augustine to question the sacral nature of the Roman power and its exercise, its arbitrariness, and its all too evident contamination through its use by men: in their flawed, impetuous, unreasoning condition as part of the massa peccati.

Suddenly, the insights of the Ad Simplicianum, the long siege of the Donatist experience, his disillusionment, confusion, and yearning for justice and peace came together in the conviction that he was and would be always peregrinans, and that neither Rome, nor Assyria, nor any earthly empire could ever be the means by which Christians would find the term of their pilgrimage in the peace of Christ. He gave up on the "Christian Empire."

In Book II of the De civitate Dei, written before 413, Augustine says that, "true justice" has no existence save in that republic whose founder and ruler is Christ, if, at least, any choose to call this a republic (CD 2.21). Much later, when he is writing Book XIX, he says, "a people is an association of rational beings united by an unanimous agreement upon those things which they love" (CD 19.24).

Gilson has a revealing comment upon this definition of a society: he sees it as purely religious, and even mystical:

> This formula does not reveal itself as immediately applicable to every kind of society; above all, to the Roman Empire. The question whether a society is

> good or bad is no longer identical with the question whether a certain group of men constitutes a people. The formula of Cicero, interpreted by a Christian, holds in the case of a single people, that is, the Christian people, which possesses the only true justice, namely, the justice of Christ. The new formula, on the contrary, makes it possible to admit that peoples are worthy of the name of people, even though they are unjust.[2]

By the end of the De civitate Dei, Augustine's most important germinal ideas have come together founded in his basic assumptions: 1) all of mankind is a massa peccati; 2) the will of man is moved by delight, by loves; 3) no society on earth has ever existed ruled by vera justitia which offers worship to the true God; 4) only the Scriptures contain sacred history.

In the light of these assumptions, Gilson's epithets are well-chosen; he calls Augustine's definition of a society "purely religious, even mystical." Certainly, it is. Augustine saw all of life as theological, a tendency deepened in the insights of his conversion, long nurtured by his mother, his reflective nature, and his searing experiences. He had come to see all of history as moral history with man's struggle for happiness as its focal point.

But by the close of the Donatist controversy (c.420), he had re-defined both man -- and his happiness. Philosophy had always told Augustine that if man pursued wisdom he would be happy; his own experience had taught him that happy man could not be without morality and truth. The truth he had now found in Scripture and from his meditation upon that Word he had come to see it alone as sacred history. In its pages he had

XUM

found man as fallen, yet redeemed, as chosen by God or rejected. Given his life-long ability to plumb the depths of a thought or a situation, how else could he interpret man's life as pilgrim except as a member of one or the other of the two cities: predestined to heaven or hell? These were the only ultimates: life with God or with Satan forever. In this perspective, God's munificent gift of saving grace was the central fact of Augustine's theology of redemption. Given that gift, what significance was there in man's status, his societies, empires, rulers? In conspectu aeternitatis, all such distinctions appeared unimportant; they were ever subject to the critical appraisal of the pilgrim en route to the City of God.

Such a theology rejects, certainly, the Eusebian-Rome theology of the fourth century, for Augustine's view of Scripture as sacred history was applied to the Roman Empire and thereby denied it any part of prophetic fulfillment or a providential role in God's plan (CD XX.11). Augustine removed the religious significance of the Roman accomplishment and thereby defused the explosive issue of Rome's fall in the minds of his congregation. His theological perspective had given him a truly original view of one of the components of the Romanitas of his time: its keystone and proof: the Roman Empire and its mystique of eternal destiny. Even in Christian terms, it was totally demythologized. Rome was just another society, theologically neutral. Augustine neither followed the Eusebian-Rome theology nor did he espouse the apocalyptic-Antichrist

XUM

theology of Hippolytus. Rather, in Books XVIII and XIX of the De civitate Dei he adopts his third position: all of life, all societies, even the Church, are a corpus permixtum (CD XVIII.49); only God knows the citizens of the City of God.

Given the four basic assumptions mentioned supra, Augustine's attitude toward the Roman Empire is all of a piece: 1) The Empire is theologically neutral; it is emphatically not God's instrument in the spread of the Gospel any more than any other society; 2) the period of the Roman Empire is not tempora Christiana, for no period is ever purely so; 3) the glorified past of the Roman Empire worshipped by his pagan intellectual confrères could have no special sacral character for Augustine. It, too, was only a part of the last times; 4) the Roman Empire was no more eternal than any other earthly society in these same last times; 5) as an earthly society, the Roman Empire could never fulfill for Christians the true goal of life: conversio (Sermo 105.6.8,etc.). Lastly, the Empire now was and might well continue to be a temptation to earthly power and its misuse as well as a deterrent to the spiritual renewal of Church and society Augustine called for after the sack of Rome. However, such a summary does not preclude the fact that the Roman Empire, like the Church, was a corpus permixtum which might contain members of both cities, those of God and man.

This neutral placement of the Roman Empire in Augustine's attitudes and writings has caused some confusion in the minds

of his readers, especially, those who confine themselves to only certain portions of his works. Isidore of Seville has legions of readers who agree with his quip that the man who says he has read the whole Augustinian corpus is a liar.[3] Yet, it is really necessary to balance some of his earlier statements against his later and final views to check and balance the possibilities of change, growth, and development, particularly in his theology. Once Augustine has taken up a position in which all men, societies, empires, associations here on earth are a corpus permixtum, a "mixed-bag" a truly Roman satura or medley of good and bad, saved and damned, who co-exist in what Markus calls the saeculum: "not a no-man's land between two cities, but as their temporal life in their interwoven, perplexed and only eschatologically separable reality,"[4] then it becomes necessary for the reader to accept the ambivalence of many of the statements that follow from such a premise.

In regard to the "state" so-called, clarification is most necessary, for Augustine had ceased to view the state, in his mature reflections, as an agent of man's perfection or fulfillment; it existed merely so that by its feared coercive power, "the wicked would be held back, and the good enabled to live less disturbed among the wicked" (Ep. 153.6.16). In his Commentary on Genesis (ad litteram) he had seen the purpose of government as "holding the wicked within the bonds of a certain earthly peace" (IX.9.14). In Book XIX of

the De civitate Dei, which was probably written only five or six years before his death in 430, Augustine calls the state the means by which the earthly city maintains temporal peace and order; in it is found "the well-ordered concord of civic obedience and rule" (CD XIX.17) -- and this is actually what the state becomes, finally, for him: an external order maintaining an external peace -- or the absence of violence, as well as a coercive force, using fear of pain and punishment for attaining obedience to its laws.

Such a society, then, does not seek to make men virtuous or to lead them to heavenly peace. The state is the result of the Fall, for in it are the massa peccati, refugees from that Fall. Therefore, it is not a natural institution,[5] as society is, but a necessary, remedial one, the result of sin. Political authority as exercised by the state helps remedy the conflict, tension, and disorder inherent in human societal groups, such as the present saeculum, the Roman Empire. In Book XII, finally, the bishop will label this saeculum "a hell on earth" (CD XII.22.4). He rather grudgingly admits that the state might also help secure the earthly peace by which men might coordinate their wills -- their values (CD XIX.17), but only because the values coordinated were not of the ultimate order like those which differentiated the citizens of the two cities. This is a logical corollary to his treatment of man's history.

For this reason, also, he must reject the political

answer proposed by Romanitas to man's search for happiness in the res publica: the Roman State could not give man assurance of attaining his ultimate values and goals through surrender of his freedom to the virtus et fortuna of some demagogue -- a method still actually perduring in his own day when the Master of Soldiers, e.g. a Stilicho, substituted for the former Emperor-cult-figure in the absolute exercise of power. Augustine could find neither in the military figure nor the Christian Emperor a ruler who could ensure happiness or vera pax for the Empire, the present corpus permixtum (CD.19; 13).

Augustine's repudiation of the philosophy of Romanitas is highlighted in his characteristically theological response to the question of which of the three philosophical sects should be preferred (CD XIX.3.1). He notes Varro's answer to the question:

> that man, because he is both body and soul, finds his highest good, his happiness, composed of goods of both kinds, both bodily and spiritual. . .that virtue, the art of living, which can be communicated by instruction, is the most excellent of spiritual goods . . .the life of man, then is called happy when it enjoys virtue and these other spiritual and bodily good things without which virtue is impossible. . . it is happiest of all, if it lacks not one of the good things which pertain to the body and the soul. For life is not the same thing as virtue, since not every life, but a wisely regulated life, is virtue.

Here, succinctly, we have what Augustine calls the "doctrines of the Old Academy, on the authority of Antiochus, Cicero's master and his (Varro's) own" (CD XIX.3), and, also, another side of the creed of Romanitas: arete, virtus, could

XUM

be taught, this art of living, the living of a "well-regulated life"; man is happy when he enjoys virtue, and he is most blessed when he lacks nothing seen as a good for body and soul." Augustine responds to this statement of belief with what has become his most characteristic yardstick: "What has the city of God to say to these points...what does it consider the supreme good and evil?" (CD XIX.4) or in what does man's true happiness consist? Romanitas and Augustine's faith-inspired analysis come face to face.

Ancient philosophy in its search for truth and way of life was bankrupt (Chapter I), for it had based the operation of its intellectual structure on reason alone, which, unaided, became the victim of every contending hypothesis and school of thought. Augustine felt it needed a principle both within and without the world; the clue to that principle was given by "faith" which took God at his Word: Holy Scripture, and His Word: the Logos, as R. H. Barrow puts it.[6] And this faith was rewarded by what the young Augustine had so strongly experienced: insight (sapientia) which throws light upon the meaning of existence and the accumulated treasure of man's knowledge.

So, when Augustine answers the question, speaking for the city of God, he says that "life eternal is the supreme good, death eternal the supreme evil, and that to obtain the one and escape the other we must live rightly" (CD XIX.4). And so, "the just man lives by faith. Neither have we power in ourselves to live rightly but can do so only if he who has given

us faith to believe in His help do help us when we believe and pray." What a contrast we have here to classical views: ancient philosophy, with the possible exception of Plato, viewed immortality of the soul as highly questionable. Augustine is rejecting wholesale classical moral theory, already found so useless as a basis for life in Late Roman society, and substituting Christian categories for the worn-out terms of pagan moral philosophy. Barrow analyzes two concepts, in particular, which are especially enlightening for Augustine's break with Romanitas as way and truth: 1) "life" is for him not the opposition of body and spirit, but the working together of the two to achieve spiritual heights, and, 2) the activity of the "will" implied in this total approach to "life": the will is the distinctive mark of man, and Augustine insists "we are nothing but wills; desire and pleasure are simply will consenting to what we wish for; fear and sorrow are simply will refusing consent to what we do not want" (CD XIV.6). Hardly in keeping with the classical emphasis on moral action coming from right knowing, itself, dependent upon the correct use of the intellect -- a stock-in-trade item of ancient philosophy. This new philosophy insists that will precedes action, motivated by love -- good or bad.

Lastly, the concept "eternal" was very important for Augustine's apologetic work, the City of God. For the pagan who had lost his "eternal Rome," and for the fifth-century Christian who had imbibed the Rome-theology, Augustine's

XUM

emphasis on the "eternal" city of God was another taking-over of a blasted hope (the eternity of Rome) and substituting for it a live concept: New Testament writers, especially John, see eternal life not as an exclusively future concept, but as begun and lived here and now: "This is eternal life -- the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou has sent." And the essence of that life lived here is union with God, motivated by the love He pours into the Christian's heart as he believes and prays.[7]

Romanitas as mystique and ideology was incarnated in various persons and institutions: a political philosophy and a moral theory or way of life, both rejected by Augustine in his neutralizing all societies and all states, including the Roman.

However, for Late Roman men, Romanitas was, perhaps, best symbolized in the person of the Emperor. And here I take the opportunity to express my own uneasiness in dealing with the term "state" in the section above. No wonder Augustine saw the "state" as necessary through man's sin as a result of the Fall and not as the natural social grouping of society. I do not believe Romans of the Late Empire were thinking in terms of "the state." It was not a question of what, but of who was the state, and the answer was personal. From the days of Augustus onwards the Emperor was actually the state; he held its coercive, its punitive power; his proconsular imperium was voted to succeeding emperors at their accession by the

Senate. Under the Empire the whole army fought under the auspicia of the Emperor and his was the salutatio, not the general's. In the Late Empire, all legislative activity was in the hands of the emperors; their imperial constitutions were binding, in general, without territorial restrictions. They could see to the execution of Theodosius's father, or of a Stilicho -- or a Marcellinus. For Augustine, in many ways, the embodiment of the "state" was a man who was also the embodiment of Romanitas.

Recall the fact that, for the Late-Roman pagan, the emperor incarnated the mos maiorum and the tradition of humanitas, respect for the great pagan past of Rome. In Augustine's lifetime Roman Emperors had to repudiate that past in giving allegiance to Christianity. Theodosius and Ambrose were a living paradigm in Augustine's own experience, and in that encounter the emperor was treated as one "within the Church, a son of the Church."[8] Augustine's attitude toward the Emperors would retain this characteristic stance: Emperors, if Christians, were members of Mater Ecclesia. In his praise of the Christian Theodosius (CD V.26) he did not emulate the Eusebian eulogy, but praised his virtues as a Christian man. Here, again, he breaks out of the panegyrical style of the fourth-century and reverts to the approach of an Irenaeus who saw government as a necessity through the sin of mankind, and rulers as set up by God for man's good as instruments of divine punishment. Emperors ruled by God's authority, and thus they

should be obeyed.[9]

Of course, Augustine knows Paul's view of government as of divine origin and the Emperor an instrument of God's wrath for man's good (Rom. 13.1-6). Optatus of Milevis in Numidia was surely known to him for his attack on the Donatists a generation before Augustine. Optatus could declare that the State was not in the Church, but the Church was in the State, i.e., the Roman Empire.[10]

But Augustine's over-riding assumptions as to man's condition had to be applied equally well to the Emperor. If all men in society were thus atomized into their basic constituent quality as members of one or the other cities, then men were constituted for him as bearers of good or evil: "evil is not found disembodied in cities, but in men who are the elements and atoms of cities" (Enar. in Ps. 9.8). It was as men who were members of the Church that he saw the Emperors of his time. It was thus that he saw Marcellinus and Boniface. This attitude of personalization helped his concept of the two cities to keep a strong identity, while the idea of "state" was ambiguous in its content for his time; it was not the term which would spring to his mind; Emperor, yes; praetor, Count -- all of these embodied the "state," but theologically he looked deeper into ultimate memberships.

Augustine does not deny the power of emperors or rulers; he recognizes imperium; in fact, he says that in making a law the ruler is not limited by the precedents of former rulers:

XUM

he must be obeyed "for obedience to princes is a general compact of human society" (Conf.III.VIII.15). The ruler must be obeyed, until he commands disobedience to God, for we still have inner freedom: "The slavery of the soul is one thing, the servitude of the body another" (De vera relig. LV.3). Yet, Augustine does not permit resistance to the command of the state or rebellion against its authority. One must die, like the martyrs, accepting quietly and joyously the punishment for refusal to obey an unjust command (Sermo 326.2). He sees imperial office as a great burden and trial. The men who have held it did so for a short time with great care and much pain: the office has been "filled by a constant succession of dying men" (CD IV.5).

This view of authority and Augustine's characteristic tendency to atomize societies into their individual components led him to view with equilibrium the use of religious coercion in the case of heretics, such as the Donatists. They, too, were sons of the Church. The Christian ruler, one of them, also, had to use his power for the good of his subjects (consulere) and with loving forethought (providendi misericordia) (CD XIX.16). Augustine is here using concepts in regard to the ruler which go far back into Greek views of the ideal ruler, earlier than those of Dio Chrysostom (Peri Basileias i.50). We have seen the ruler as "living law" nomos empsuchos, in the Hellenistic monarchies (CH.I.supra). Augustine's view of political authority caused him to label it a result of the

Fall, a painful necessity. But by the time he writes Book XIX he has identified with that painful necessity, e.g. his example of the righteous judge (XIX.6) who, in spite of himself, is forced by circumstances and the pressure of the saeculum and its wounded nature to dispense injustice. Yet, he concludes, a man will still serve -- he knew what it was to sit in judgment. The Christian does not ignore or isolate himself from the temporal order, the saeculum, for it contains the inhabitants of both cities, and he never knows of a certainty, in via, which is which. So, as a quasi-ruler, Augustine looked at the Emperor, himself the living symbol of all that Romanitas claimed for the City of Man. Roman tradition had ascribed to the Emperor virtues like those chosen by Augustus: virtus, justitia, pietas, and clementia. Augustus attributed his restoration of peace to providentia. Barrow traces the process by which this appelation became, through coins, inscriptions, and literature, "the wise choice of a successor helped by divine planning." He emphasized the fact that providentia on such materials, especially the coinage, was often more a prayer than a statement, appealing to the emotions.

Augustine, however, sees a providentia, active in the saeculum, indeed, but that of the God of the Christians. No matter how fearful the context or how passing the story of that saeculum for a particular generation, the bishop's theological reflection has by the end of the De civitate Dei given such sorrow its proper place, its ordo in the universe.

Nothing falls outside the Providence of God:

> For all men are ordered in their proper places; but to every man it seems as though they have no order. Do thou only look to what thou wouldest wish to be; for as thou shalt wish to be, the Master knoweth where to place thee...take no care where He may order thee who cannot err, He knoweth where to place thee.[12]

When earthly rulers rule, this function, too, is part of the Divine Plan. Power is from God:

> that God, the author and giver of felicity, because He alone is the true God, Himself gives earthly kingdoms both to good and bad. Neither does He do this rashly, and,...fortuitously -- because He is God, not fortune -- but according to the order of things and times which is hidden from us, but thoroughly known to Himself; which same order of times, however, He does not serve as subject to it, but Himself rules as Lord and appoints as governor. Happiness He gives only to the good. Whether a man be a subject or a king makes no difference: He may equally either possess or not possess it. And it shall be full in that life where kings and subjects exist no longer. And therefore, earthly kingdoms are given by Him both to the good and bad; lest his worshippers, still under the conduct of a very weak mind, should covet these gifts from Him as great. (CD IV.33).

Having disposed of the myth of power as divinely possessed by the ruler for himself, Augustine makes the great differentiation: happiness the Lord gives only to the good; kingdoms are no great thing; only the "full" happiness of His kingdom where there are no rulers or ruled. Significantly, he then adds: "This is the mystery of the Old Testament in which the New is hidden, that there even earthly gifts are promised: those who were spiritual understanding even then, though not

XUM

yet openly declaring both the eternity symbolized by these earthly things and in what gifts of God true felicity could be found" (CD IV.33). Those lines were probably written in 415, after "rashly-ordered" execution of Marcellinus.

The passage is remarkable, too, for the over-all approach Augustine takes to both society and history: the Old Testament in this later thinking is not a stage in a moral ascent of the human race but the present-now complement of the New Testament. Brown suggests that Augustine's early justification of the Old Testament to the Manichees also included justifying a coercive situation: Israel's laws had been imposed on the Israelites by fear; the Law had been a paedagogus.[13] Later, Augustine saw history with the Old Testament even closer to his own time. This view gave him an attitude toward the new phenomenon in his own political and social milieu: not only a quasi-Christian Empire, but an Emperor who acted like another David, a repentant son of the Church, Theodosius. The New Testament offered no such comparison as that found in Kings and Prophets. Suddenly, Christianity was, also, an established religion with imperial servitors closing the temples and suppressing the worship of its rivals -- even more, carrying out the theological decisions of its bishops as to inclusion and excommunication. No wonder the younger bishop could see the use of coercion by the civil arm!

However, before we treat that topic, a look at the historical development of other elements in his theological spectrum.

XUM

A central theological concept noted at the opening of this chapter is that of Augustine's idea of the Church. Augustine reflected, prayed, wrote, acted, since his ordination, as a churchman, and as he hoped, a member of the city of God now and to-be. This very sentence contains some of the ambiguity of the question we now entertain. With Augustine, one must learn to live with ambiguity, a rather realistic situation, for he was a very complex human being. Later times have wished for and even constructed from his writings iron-clad views and definitions. He was much more occupied with answering his own pastoral questions, satisfying his perplexed congregation, and being faithful to His God as He saw Him. Still, given his basic assumptions, especially, that of man choosing his loves, and thereby, because of his spiritual autonomy, creating the basic dualism Augustine sees everywhere (the natural man seeking earthly happiness; the spiritual man seeking eternal peace) his theology does contain some confusing statements. Out of that basic bifurcation will come two types of men, two types of society, and two loves will build two cities (CD 14.28).

One such ambiguity I noted previously: that of "state." From the second century to the sixth Roman law cited one and only one source for political power, that of the res publica and the imperium Romanum: the authority of the populus, couched in Ulpian's famous phrase from the Digest: "Whatever the princeps decrees has the force of law" -- with the rather startling continuation: that this fact is so because the

people have conferred upon him all their imperium and potestas (Dig.i.4.1). This remained the creed of the Roman lawyers well on into the seventh century.

Meanwhile, New Testament writers and the Fathers after them had to handle the relationship of their Christian community to the Roman colossus. And we have the whole spectrum of attitudes from the fiercely anti-Roman views of the Apocalypse to the erastian declarations of Optatus of Milevis. Paul had to take a stand on the matter: "For we hear that some of you walk disorderly, you work and eat their own bread" (2 Thes.3.6-12). Paul, in the first century, experienced what Luther would suffer in the sixteenth: "the freedom of the christian man" could be an explosive concept in societal context. The reaction against the legalistic aspects of their social, political, and religious milieux was heady fare for the new Christians and Paul had to quell anarchical tendencies in the community.

Certainly, the most important passage in the New Testament on this subject is in Paul's Epistle to the Romans: "Let every one be subject to higher powers: for there is no power but of God; and the powers that be are ordained of God: and he that withstands the power, resists the ordinance of God: and they that withstand shall receive to themselves judgment...the power is a minister of God, an avenger for wrath to him that doeth evil" (Rom.13.1-7).[14] Augustine's lectures on Romans and his Expositio (noted supra (Ch. IV) had a profound effect upon his view of man and society, and, ultimately (by Book XIX of the

De civitate Dei) of the state: God alone was the source of any power of man over man. True justice existed only in that society which worshipped the true God; in the saeculum there was none such nor ever would be. His own painful experience had taught him that:

> The imperial city tries to communicate her language to all the lands she has subdued to procure a fuller society...but how many lives has this cost!...the wider extension of her empire produced still greater wars...so he that does not consider with compassion all these extremes of sorrow and bloodshed must say that this is a mystery but he that endures them without a sorrowful emotion or thought thereof, is far more wretched to imagine he has the bliss of a god, when he has lost the natural feelings of a man (CD XIX.7).

Yet, in spite of the seeming ambiguity of calling for an unconditional obedience to the state, while decrying its injustice, Augustine has given us "the first systematic treatise in which due consideration is given to the state from the Christian angle. The spheres of the state and of religion are more closely defined and a modus vivendi is worked out for the Christian."[15] Limits are more clearly drawn, even if Augustine was writing in a semi-pagan world. In spite of the enormity and injustice of imperial history, Augustine allows the Christian to participate fully in its life, with one condition (and he is not contradicting himself here). This position is the logical result of 1) his meditation upon Scripture, especially Paul's Epistles; 2) his social dualism which saw the two cities underlying any and every societal institution or grouping; and 3) his acceptance

of the "hell on earth" of the saeculum as the locus of the two cities here and now, therefore, its ultimate significance as the temporary residence of the peregrini Christiani who passed through its societies.

The conclusion one may not draw from his statements is that he envisioned the ultimate resolution of the dualism and relied on the establishment of Christianity as a state religion to end the dichotomy. Always, the great divide would remain. Ultimately, all societies will be reduced to their basic units: men who belong to one or the other city. Augustine's views on Providence and history made him value the state, but he was not interested in developing political theory; he finally decided that the state is one huge hospital, for men are wounded and sick. Remove the sickness; remove the state; it would cease to have reason to exist (Sermo 4.12).

For the scope of this thesis, however, our interest is to see Augustine's attitude toward Romanitas; the state as Roman Empire and its ruler: symbols of that ideology. The question, then, follows: what does Augustine's final word on the Empire or its ruler reveal as to his views about them as part of the total mystique of Romanitas? Certainly, he states quite clearly that he will try to demonstrate that "the Roman Commonwealth was never a commonwealth to satisfy Scipio's definition in Cicero's books 'On the Commonwealth'" (CD XIX.21). And why? For he defines a republic as "the will of the people." And if this definition be true, "there never was a Roman republic, for

XUM

the people's will was never attained among the Romans" (CD XIX.21). He then contends that the real reason why Rome is not a republic is because in it there is no righteousness which assigns to each his due. Significantly, he wants to know what sort of justice is it that steals man himself away from the true God and makes him subject to foul deities. Augustine contends that if a man's mind is just it is ruled by God; if not, there can be no righteousness (justice) in a state composed of such men. In Chapter 22, Augustine strongly bolsters his arguments against the worship of pagan gods. Here he is attaining his goal stated in the Preface "to defend the City of God against those who prefer their own gods." Augustine does not totally abandon Rome, its Empire, nor its rulers, but he attacks the reason for the unrighteousness which clings to all of Romanitas: its taint of <u>false gods</u>. Ziegler notes, following Ladner, that "for Augustine, the centre of the city of the pagans was the <u>cult of the false gods</u>"[16] -- the very gods who did not defend the city against Alaric, nor did they rescue it in the past. Augustine puts at the heart of the city of God, in their place, the worship of the one God -- and no society will ever be just without such worship.

A further attitude: toward the intellectual content of Romanitas is seen in Chapters 22 and 23. Augustine calls upon his two wise men, paragons of the wisdom and philosophy of Romanitas, to give witness to the true God, even unwittingly:

Varro, the Roman polymath and symbol of the peak of Roman intellectual achievement, and Porphyry whom he calls the "most learned of the philosophers and the bitterest enemy of the Christians."

Fittingly, Augustine here completes his demolition of Scipio's definition of the commonwealth: Rome, by Augustine's historical investigation is declared not a republic, but to be logical and to complete his historical approach, he sets up a minimum bare-bones definition of a republic: "a people is a multitude of rational beings united in fellowship by sharing a common love of the same things" (CD.XIX.24). How empty! Certainly, that is exactly what the master rhetor is doing with his best tool: language. Even the brevity is eloquent. All quality, all values, all moral content has been stripped away. You see, says Augustine, that is exactly what I've been trying to say: there is no true city but the city of God in which true justice resides, for there God is adored.

He did not present a political philosophy or describe an ideal earthly state, Christian or not; such was not his object. Augustine is giving a straight forward historical description of what the record and experience have taught him about earthly states. He is not giving advice on ideal forms of the state, but baldly honest about what his theological reflection has revealed. And his thinking is all of a piece. States are made up of individual men whose wills and loves are set in different directions. His views of man and society, come together in his

keen analysis of the evidence. Given his psychology, sociology, and theology, the historical record tells him when he reflects upon it in the light of God's revelation in Scripture, interpreting the shape and the meaning of his own experience, that there is only one just society, partly in history, partly in eternity for now, the civitas Dei.

Augustine's assessment of Rome, its Empire and rulers, his reply to the claims of Varro and Porphyry had abrogated and discarded the answers Graeco-Roman philosophy and political theory gave through the ideology of Romanitas to man's search for answers to the True, Good, Beautiful and Eternal. However, in giving that answer, he used every tool of the craft by which Romanitas spread its teaching and confirmed its votaries: classical dialectic and rhetoric. Even the thought-forms he used in rebuttal were often drawn from the intellectual idiom of the Neo-Platonists and found expression in his exegesis and sermons, let alone in his major theological works.[17] He used such ammunition to express his beliefs: he will agree, for instance, with Plotinus that the soul, God's work, desires to see Him, and Augustine agrees that the visio Dei is the summum bonum (CD VIII.8). He will use the Neo-Platonic belief in incorporeal and intelligible substance; the forms are Christianized by conceiving of them as thoughts in the mind of God. Augustine believes that the ordo universi revealed in Scripture is the same as the imperfect realization in this world of the Platonic idea.[18]

XUM

For our purposes here, we see Neo-Platonism giving Augustine insight into the relationship of God to his creation, as present in all things (Enn. 6.9.2.3), the ultimate reason in and behind all things. Still, he insists that his God is personal and aware of our needs. Even more Greek is his adherence, in this connection, to the idea of a Universal Law, his realization of a universal reasonable order binding all nature together:

> The true God from whom is all being, beauty, form and number,. . .having left neither heaven nor earth, nor angel nor man. . .without the true harmony of their parts, and peaceful concord of composition; it is in no way credible that He would leave the kingdoms of men and their bondage and freedoms loose and uncomprised in the laws of His eternal providence (CD V.11).

Here is one of the sources of his final view of Providence[19] a layer of his classical background not discarded but deepened through interpretation and made part of his theology. A few among myriad examples of the eclectic nature of Augustine's philosophical and theological tools: concepts, vocabulary, dialectic, and rhetorical devices -- examples too, of what he found useful and worthy of retaining in his own daily living of the heritage of Romanitas: its paideia-humanitas as a mighty weapon in fighting the battles of the Lord.

I stress this retention by Augustine of much of the perspective, wider viewpoint, and experience of the thought-systems of pagan, Jewish, and sectarian thought because this ambience gave him what Lucien Febvre has called an outillage

moral[20] -- moral equipment, a term which I have attempted to English through the subject-headings of the preceding five chapters: Augustine's culture, education, environment, experience, and expectations. The combination of these five factors gave him a background, a see-level, a perspective or vision, in short a moral dynamic.

When we assess his attitudes, it is, also, necessary for us to see as widely as possible what our man saw out of his ambience, his moral dynamic.[21] This more or less characteristic way of perceiving, reacting to, and behaving toward a person, situation, or object is one way of describing an attitude. Obviously, its components are not purely rational, but made up of a rich variety of feelings, insights, intuitions, memories, prejudices and biases as well as of intellectual conclusions, judgments, and decisions. For this reason, when I present many of Augustine's conclusions in regard to Romanitas which totally discard the ideology, I do not mean to imply that he ever shed his classical past entirely -- simply because he would be the first to tell us that it was impossible to do so -- as he told Pelagius so many times. And vis consuetudinis, the force of habit, influenced not only Augustine's theology, but his psychology as well. To Book VIII of his Confessiones, with its miraculous conversion, he would oppose Book X: "Now is all my hope nowhere but in thy great mercy. Give what thou commandest, and command what thou wilt" (X.29). No man could ever lose his past -- and

that could be good -- witness Augustine's own masterly use of the gifts of Romanitas, the spoils of the Egyptians, to write his greatest prayer: the Confessiones, and his greatest apologia: the De Civitate Dei.

Dawson notes the contribution made by Augustine's Neoplatonic background to ideas such as: universal order, what he calls his "philosophic universalism," to his view of history, of the earthly city, of the value of the social virtues of the worldly, of the uses of the disorder in history in God's ordering of all things in His providence in an incomprehensible yet veritable harmony.[22] Most importantly, I agree with Dawson, that this wider scope, this use of philosophic backgrounds allowed him to conceive of an eschatology, and finally, of a theology of the Church which enlarged the dimensions of the view Christians had taken of that entity thus far in the Christian community. In this connection the element of greater perspective also enabled him to reach conclusions as to the concept of the city of God which liberated him from the African view: the literal, apocalyptic approach to both Church and society, including their ideologies.

Through the instrumentality of this wide-screen, we can clarify Augustine's use of the terminology of the two cities and see how he risked ambiguity rather than lose the richness of the concept. Markus puts it well: "No identification of either of the two cities with any institution or with any empirically definable body of people can be reconciled with

that radical dichotomy (self-love vs. love of God)."[23] What we must remember, he contends, is that although membership in the two cities is mutually exclusive, membership in either is compatible both with belonging to the Roman state and to the Church -- as Augustine himself did. A closer look at this seeming ambiguity will help us assess Augustine's attitude toward the Romanitas which informed both societies in the fifth century A.D.

In regard to Augustine's idea of Church, the appellation "City of God" cannot be applied without qualification to the visible hierarchical Church, for the former is of a piece with spiritual creation insofar as it has not been contaminated by sin. It is the spiritual unity of the whole universe, as planned by Divine Providence, and the ultimate goal of creation. Undoubtedly, Augustine's ecclesiology was developed and embellished during his struggle with the Donatists, a group who claimed to be the Church of the perfecti, the martyrs. He contended that this present, visible Church could not be the same as the Church purified of all stain after the Last Judgment (C.Parm.3.3.17). Yet, the communio sanctorum exists now, although one cannot assign it definite members, for it has these within and without its own borders (In evan. Ioh. 45.12). But, it is not solely eschatological; it is both spiritual and transcendent.

The Church, then, as he saw her, is much more than she seems. One cannot identify her in time with the City of God,

for she has a mixture of saints and sinners here, but, still, the two concepts are not completely exclusive. The Church, Ecclesia Mater, is certainly the point of insertion in time of the city of God, its organ, its representative now. In contrast to Origen's idea of the Church as identical with the Christian fatherland (C.Celsum VIII.75), a doctrine of the Church as Body of Christ here and now, expressed in terms of the kingdom of God, the autobasileia, Augustine will use the terms: civitas, societas, congregatio, communio (CD, passim), in line with what Ladner feels is his intention to "point up the difference between that which is essentially celestial and that which was all too terrestrial."[24] And his reason: fear of the Church's succumbing to her own success: her position in the imperial milieu. Therefore, he identified the Regnum Dei with the final stage of the Civitas Dei reunited in heaven. Yet, sometimes he would say that the Church was the regnum caelorum, identifying it with the millenial kingdom of the Apocalypse: "Ecclesia et nunc est regnum Christi renumque caelorum" (CD.XX.10). Augustine needed the term civitas to designate the condition of citizens who are God's people on the pilgrim way, and used it to designate his theological interpretation of world history, for Augustine's zeal sought to embrace those men who, with or without any fault of their own, were not yet part of Christ's body, but finally would be so.

Ladner feels strongly that Augustine's use of civitas is

tightly bound to the finality of the work itself: to defend Christianity against paganism and heresy, yes, but also to push for reform: to hold up to the worldly an ideal of life. So he used familiar Roman political categories: respublica and civitas, and gradually proceeded to an explicit identification of civitas and ecclesia, yet not choosing the latter term because it was a too-familiar category, too sacred and delicate, given the embattled position of the Church of his time, spiritually speaking, while civitas would give him the "doubleness in unity" he wanted to express.[25]

Augustine, himself, gave some very important reasons why he wrote the De Civitate. Preaching in Carthage when he had begun the work: "When therefore, death shall be swallowed up in victory, these things will not be there; and there shall be peace, peace full and eternal. We shall be in a kind of city. Brethren, when I speak of that city...I just cannot bring myself to stop" (En. in Ps. 84.10).

Donatism had convinced him that the sociological approach which made the Church a spiritual enclave of perfecti had to be replaced with a concept which would transcend such a view; he used the eschatological one developed from his study of Scripture and his own life-long experience: the city of the perfecti -- in his terms: the elect -- had a specific relationship with the city of God in heaven. Only there, are all men free from all stain. In this world both Church and state are contaminated, mixed; they are both secular.[26] From his

eschatological perspective both must always remain ambivalent.

This is a difficult approach, too, for some who feel that Augustine's role within the Church, his passionate espousal of her cause cannot be reconciled with such a secularizing of "Church." However, the bishop is using one of his major assumptions: all of history, including the story of the Church Militant, is part of the last times; anything not indicated in the Scripture (New Testament, in particular) about the Church exists in this great gap between the Incarnation and the Parousia. Its true meaning is still a mystery, sharing the same uncertainty, ambivalence, liability to corruption and sin as all other sociological entities of that period.

This thinking, logically developed, leads us to some rather startling conclusions in the line of those above, and necessarily following from them: that the Church in carrying out its mission to save the world is not the city of God, though that city will exist both within and without it, yet it is the city of God alone which carries out the divine mission of reconciling souls to God. Its citizens are attached by love to God, either explicitly or not; it is an affair of the heart.

But, now comes another puzzle: if the membership is anonymous, known only to God, what is the criterion of membership? For, at this moment the Church is actually that part of the world which has been redeemed and reconciled to God,

XUM

so how is the Church related to the city here and now? They are certainly not synonymous. Augustine could not accept the Empire's growing by accretion into the city of God through its Christianization. No more could he logically accept the growth of the Church into the city, although she is "in fact and by right in the very essence of her will, the incarnation of the city of God".[27] There is no question of growth of either social body into its perfect future form, for, most simply stated, the criterion of membership is God's choice.[28]

One is brought up short with that blunt distinction, for with the introduction of predestination the valuable distinction between a visible and an invisible Church becomes blurred, for an extreme doctrine of predestination cannot be reconciled with a view of the Church on earth as containing both good and evil in unresolved tension.[29] It is interesting that the advantage Augustine gained by applying his Platonism to solve Cyprian's difficulty by showing how grace may flow outside the visible Church was lost in the extreme application of the doctrine of predestination to which he was pushed by another pastoral exigency: the threat of the theologies of Pelagius and Julian of Eclanum.

Augustine was only a human being immersed in the problems, the tension, the rush of events in his African milieu. Pastoral need waits for no man. He had to have answers, and given his successful intellectual background as teacher, rhetor, priest and bishop, he was constantly besieged for

such answers and not of a minuscule nature, e.g. why did God let the barbarians sack Christian Rome? He would make use of his Platonic philosophical background to help solve the dilemma in Cyprian's puzzlement over grace outside the visible Church, using the visible as the phenomenal church, the mere pattern of the real Church invisible in heaven. But one question answered only opened a fresh box entirely -- and the questions could become, thereby, even more complicated. For instance, if the city of God and the city of man are mixed here below, how is their membership ascertained? That answer from Augustine led to a criterion of membership which actually provided more questions than he could answer.

In this same connection, how valid is it for us to fasten upon the fifth century an idea of "church" which it could hardly have entertained? As an active, participating sociological entity in the ancient world, the "church" was barely 100 years old in 413 A.D. If "state" was a rather strange concept viewed separately from its religious context for ancient Romans, "church" was a long puzzle slowly unraveled as churchmen and emperors worked out what it meant to be "church" in a converting Roman Empire. Therefore, when Augustine decided that the imperial power might be used to help solve an ecclesiastical problem he was quite consistent with his own culture and history. Constantine instituted that very practice. Optatus of Milevis probably expressed the general feeling of ancient Christians better than Augustine's

speculations, for the Church was actually de facto "part of the civil administration," as Baynes insists: the guardian of orphans; it provided judges for courts and bishops as defenders of cities.[30]

As Fustel de Coulanges could not conceive of ancient life without its inseparable religious aspect, so also, a sharp division of Church and State was not a fourth-fifth century Christian assumption -- all the more significant Augustine's attempt to use all the weapons in his armory to set the relationship in a new frame of reference: the only true one for him: its spiritual, its mystical meaning: two loves built the two cities, not power, nor reason, nor history.

As an official administering justice in his audientia, Augustine constantly met with and influenced the "state" (Ep. 133.2.e.g.). This same "earthly city" must be ready to serve Christ by serving His Church, serving higher goals in its administration if it was to borrow the justice and the love it needed, as Willis points out.[31] This reciprocal aid in kind: riches of one society freely passing to the other in need, included the aid of the imperial arm when the Church was in need of such help.

In 408, surrounded by the imperial repression of paganism, hopeful for the Donatist conversion, Augustine dropped his reluctance to countenance the use of coercion against them for fear of feigned conversions (Ep. 93.5.17), but this was no reversal in his theology of the tempora Christiana,

so strong in 400, for the "state" so-called was at that time repressing all opposition to Christ's Church: the pagan, especially. Why were heretics different? This was all part of God's plan of salvation, the fulfillment of prophecy (De cat. rud. 3.5). Certainly, this view of the oneness of the Empire and the Church together doing God's work gave him every reason to see the use of coercion as a serving of God.

The sack of Rome, however, led to another world-view; the Christian times were the present times, yes, but so also were they pagan and neutral. The City of God uses the expression "last times" as this in-between-time from the Incarnation to the Parousia, and not the triumphalist Theodosian meaning. Again, we have another instance of the living, growing, changing historical exigencies which so shaped Augustine's theology; it was not a progress through successive courses or volumes in a series; it was working through the hard knots of daily living (Ep. 73.1.1) without an answer book, and he, himself, was part of both question and answer. He was part of the establishment of the empire and of the Church, and as he fervently trusted, of the city of God!

Thus far, the historical, cultural setting of Augustine's changing attitude toward the use of imperial power, especially, its use in religious coercion. His motivations seem to be rooted in a corresponding growth in his study of Scripture, his reflection upon his own pastoral experience, and his consequent theological development, particularly, in his view

of grace and predestination. His attitudes in the Ad Simplicianum are directly applied to the pastoral problem of coercion of the fanatic, Gaudentius, some twenty-four years later in the closing gun of the Donatist controversy.[32] Although the view of grace and predestination are basically the same, the application of such a view to the coercion of the heretic is now firm: the minds and hearts of men, even of the heretic being coerced, were known only to God; they were his or not. Their "feigned" conversions were not Augustine's problem.

Augustine had grown to understand too deeply the complexity of other men's motivations, feelings, thought processes, pressures, to demand from them what he could not from himself: a complete coherence and consistency between God-given freedom and existential choices. In fact, he would have understood, very well indeed, in his own terms, Weber's warning: consider both the external environment and the internal motivations of men who are responding to and shaping the external world by their personal decisions and acts -- the whole, an on-going process, never static, chameleon-like in its fluctuating, shifting reception of influences and forces reacting upon the moral dynamic of man's background as of this very hour. Augustine was fascinated by this process in his own moral journey -- witness the Confessiones. He could hardly deny other men a like freedom -- nor a like complexity -- an acknowledgement artistically synthesized in his surviving sermon on the subject of compulsion: "Foris inveniatur

necessitas, nascitur intus voluntas" (Sermo 112.8): "Let constraint be found without; within is born the will."[33]

The same polarity which had constantly erupted in Augustine's life and thought perdured in the question of coercion. Men, true, belonged to either of the cities of God's predestination, but they lived out their story in the social milieu, a corpus permixtum. For this reason, the visible Church existed in a social forum; it was truly the new humanity in the very process of formation; it tried to build the city of God as its representative now until the temple of God is built (CD XIX.4). When, then, the force of coercion had been employed, it was done in the saeculum by the Church using imperial power, but, for that reason, it had to be done under the watchful gaze of the bishops ensuring that the process would lead to correctio[34] using the procedures of the Church's discipline.

This careful surveillance was all the more necessary since the Church was not doing the corrective work alone, in isolation, but as we have emphasized above, the two societies in the imperial complex acted together to coerce the heretic. In this acting together, the Empire was not exclusively motivated by purely religious concerns. Indeed, the question of imperial reputation, and imperial effectiveness was intimately involved. Without the Church, particularly in Africa, the Emperor could not attain his goals in this area. Imperial legislation still aimed, as in the days of Decius and

Diocletian, at uniting the Empire, bringing men under imperial control. It would fail utterly -- without the *instantia* of the Catholic Church. This use actually constituted the Donatist charge: *Ipse est Ecclesiae persecutor in eadem civitate ubi ego episcopus sum* (Coll. Carth. i.139). The importance of Africa in the imperial prestige, the necessity of its peaceful, orderly grain shipments, the maintenance of imperial law and order -- all of these depended, in this question, on the cooperation of the only reliable executors of imperial decrees, the bishops, and against the Donatist, in particular. Yet the harshness of fifth century law necessitated *intercessio* from these same agents even as they sought to enforce the laws (*Epp.*133 and 139 e.g.) as did Augustine time after time.

The Church in Africa which had performed this task for a hundred years, had suffered through its own identity crisis. Was it the Church of the Donatists, pure, without taint, suffering, persecuted, martyred, dominated by a theology of polarities of those within and without? Or was it the Church which had seemed to develop in the mind of Augustine along with the very tissue of his adult years: a "catholic" Church which existed in communion with the churches of the world, of Milan, of Bethlehem, of Gaul, Alexandria, and Carthage? Given his background, his experience of membership in a sect, his philosophical truth-trips, and his conversion -- let alone Ambrose, Simplicianus, and Jerome, he would have to see the Church as

XUM

one in communion with the universus orbis Christianus (Gesta Coll. Carth. III.99).

Yet, his was a theology deeply at one with the African tradition of Cyprian, fed upon the insights of the great Donatist Tyconius (Retr. I.18), who argued for a Church with a mixture of good and bad, the Body of Christ with two parts, so the Church could be at the same time holy and wicked (Reg. ii): her holiness was eschatological, members and ministry alike. How would Augustine, then, see her in the light of his view of the two cities? He found the Church not neutrally open to both cities in the way that the state was. It could be one with the city of God in a way possible to no other earthly society, for in the Church alone was salvation, in it men were introduced to the redemptive action of Christ. It was, then, the historical representative of the city of God on earth; she was ever in via, so ever in tension between what she is and what she will be, and that viewpoint gave entrance into the Church to the earthly city, as well (CD XX.9).

Above all, Augustine is the theologian of Church unity, the mystery of communion in the Trinity, a total community indivisible in the one Spirit which makes them one:

> The sons of God are the Body of the one and only Son of God. . .what sons of God? The members of the Son of God. It is through love that He becomes one of His own members...that he enters into the Unity of the Body of Christ, and there will be only one Christ loving Himself...when you love the members of Christ you love him; when you love him, you love the Son of God...Love then is indivisible. Choose to love one and all the others follow your choice (In ep. Ioh.10.3).

XUM

Augustine, in the De civitate Dei, as he neared the end of the magnum opus, could point out that it was in the Church that the prophecies of the kingdom find fulfillment. . .that there was a "coming of the Saviour which continually occurs in His Church, that is, in His members, in which He comes little by little, and piece by piece, since the whole Church is His Body" (CD XX.5). Yet, in answer to the Donatists, he had to distinguish, also, the fact that, as of now, although the Church was coextensive with the world, they are truly distinct, but, as we have seen, that is an eschatological distinction; the Church is the world reconciled in Christ (Sermo 96.8). Just as he left the hearts of the heretics to their maker; they were in the hand of Providence; so, also, he could leave the saeculum, with its societies of Church and Empire in the same security.

This conclusion left Augustine with a wonderfully ambivalent Church, but one of which he was both member and pastor. He was also, mutatis mutandis, an official of the Roman State with the obligation to carry out, to advise, and to implement decrees in regard to religion. Violence and force were one question, but his duties were another and not a subject of long cogitation for him. We have seen the ambiguity latent in the questionable historical thinking possibly found in our own use of the sharply disparate terms "church" and "state," given our history and categories. After 25 years as a bishop and judge, in a society which had again wedded religion and

the state officially, he was part of the regime. Markus sees Augustine's use of coercion coming out of the framework of his role as churchman who was pastor: a piece of pastoral strategy.[35] He cites Epistle 93 as the keynote: religious coercion is medicine for a patient for his own good, a work of love. . .God scourges those whom He loves. . .Donatists returned to the fold are grateful for compulsion to help them break the vis consuetudinis (5.18); it was a valuable disciplina of the Church, their loving Mother. He sees the goal of all such pastoral compulsion, such loving discipline, as unity in the Body: "if you love unity, then whoever has anything in the unity of the Church, has it for you" (In evang. Ioh. 32.8).[36]

This brief glance at some of the ambiguity inherent in Augustine's attitude toward imperial power and its use by the Church helps us see the ambiguity present, also, in the use of ecclesiastical power by the Emperor. And neither use was simple, nor brought about by simple motivations. It is not enough to ascribe the coercion of heretics by the Emperor to his need for a united Empire and a peaceful Africa.[36] Of necessity, even a policy based upon the defense of orthodoxy alone would still be subject to change when the political crises of the time dictated another approach, e.g. during the siege of Alaric, officials in Africa engaged in religious coercion suddenly favored temporary toleration (Cod. Theod. XVI.V.51). Still, one hundred years of anti-pagan legislation

in various forms was here nine-tenths of the law, and easily invoked as hoary tradition by a Theodosius or an Honorius.

No more simple would be Augustine's approach to cooperation with the Emperor, whether in carrying out his legal duties as bishop or in the suppression of heresy. Yet, I cannot but emphasize the fact that Augustine would approach his action and theologizing out of the context of a moral dynamic formed by his life in the Church, that Church which, no matter how obvious her defects, was his Mater, perhaps the valiant woman who now replaced Monnica in his adult life: "Mother, one prolific with young: of her are we born, by her milk we are fed, by her spirit we are made alive."[37] More than that, for Augustine she was a haven in the storm of controversy, a majestic, venerable presence, an encompassing community of like-believers and brothers in the Lord, for she was, above all, the Mother who made them brothers. Once before, in the agony of his conversion-struggle, he had seen just such a feminine figure: "cheerful, not dissolutely pleasant, honestly coaxing me to come to her, and to doubt nothing; yea, stretching forth those devout hands of hers, so full of a multitude of good examples, both to receive and to embrace me" (Conf. VIII.11). She was the chaste dignity of continence (casta dignitas continentiae).

So, also, Augustine the convert, priest and bishop found his strongest identity in being a son of such a Mother: the Catholic Church, whose creed and tradition had been received

XUM

from the apostles and passed on by generations of Christians to himself, through her consuetudo, but this, a salubrious one: the custom of the Mater Universalis who assured him by her authority of the authenticity of the Scriptures, and gave him the moral framework within which his conscience had been and was being formed (De util. cred. XVII.35).

Augustine's background, his moral dynamic, offers tantalizing vistas for exploration in this matter of the Church as Mater: what of the transference of the image of Monnica the ever-persevering, adamant, coercive, righteous presence of his pre-conversion experience into the Mater Ecclesia, no less than Monnica, one who forgave, yes, but whose immense auctoritas[38] was brought to bear on the sinner, whose disciplina was administered with love, who, also, would "triumph, rejoice, leap for joy, and bless thee, able to do above that which we ask or imagine" (Conf. VIII.12) at the news of a conversion -- even of a Donatist who had been compelled to come in. Only such an institution seemed to him able to win the allegiance and direct the confused steps of Late-Roman men. Her auctoritas had led him, dodging, protesting, evading, finally, into her bosom; why not his contemporaries? Coercion, given such an attitude, was a logical conclusion (Ep. 173). The full-blown results of such an attitude appear in all their clarity in Augustine's Epistle to Boniface, his "son" and governor of Africa under Honorius and Galla Placidia: "a book on the treatment of the Donatists, because of some who did not

want them to be disciplined under the imperial laws" (Retrac. II.48). He concludes the Epistle, admonishing the Donatists to:

> have bitter sorrow for their former detestable wrongdoing...and let them come to the true Church...their Catholic mother...we exhort them, we compel them to come in when we find them in the highways...Let them come; let there be peace in the strength of Jerusalem, the strength which is charity...let them not rise up against the motherly anxiety which she had and has to gather them in...let them not be proud that she thus welcomes them...let them not turn to the evil purpose of self-esteem what she does for the good purpose of peace (Ep. 185.46).[39]

Such a mother had helped form his conscience: Monnica; such a Mother continued to form and strengthen it now: Mater Ecclesia. From within her fold, Augustine looked at his world, looked at the ideology of Romanitas. He himself was magna pars in the evolving self-concept of the community of the People of God on earth which she was, for, gradually, from being shaped by that community he had grown to contributing to her life by his free, responsible ethical decisions, and so he left her a heritage of theology and pastoral ministry.

XUM

EPILOGUE

In the preceding chapters I have attempted to sketch some components of Augustine's attitudes toward Romanitas with no claim whatever to completeness in content or interpretation.[40] This limitation of scope seemed necessary because of my prior aim in writing this sketch: to try to investigate the manner in which these attitudes evolved:[41] their genesis, possible causation, and speculation as to motivations. I was especially interested in those attitudes which issued in action: theological action and theological writing. In other words, I wanted to study the process of the evolution of one man's theology making use of some insights from the behavioral, sociological, and political disciplines insofar as these contributed to a rounded picture of how Augustine's attitudes evolved.

Strictures already noted as to the precariousness of such an assessment are to be reiterated here as we face some possible conclusions, but in spite of such caveats and their accompanying fears-to-tread, the exploration and investigation have been stimulating and profitable. All the more so in the time in which we live: one of rapid social change, one highly comparable to Augustine's social and cultural revolution.

Long before I read Peter Brown's Augustine of Hippo, I read Max Weber -- and Dante, Aquinas, and Paul. Each man, in his own way, was fascinated by that vital, unpredictable life-area in which the external and internal forces, drives, and

XUM

motivations mutually impinge upon and shape one another. It is for this reason that I wanted to investigate something of the matrix of Augustine's attitudes, especially, the values (the loves) which seemed to spur him onward, to inspire and "call him across" to follow after. Yet, a study of what he cherished or rejected only proved intelligible in the light of the components operative in his moral dynamic: his culture, his education, his explosive environment, his immensely demanding pastoral experience, and the ever-rising sights of his expectations.

Such a choice of emphasis has led to a seeming neglect of some of the "standard" Augustinian authorities, the periti of every work on Augustine, but their work has been so assimilated into those I have cited, in general, that they are still represented. It was certainly impossible to cover anything but a small portion of the immense scholarship dealing with the Donatist controversy and with the theology of Augustine, in spite of the narrow scope of this attempt.

Finally, in the exploration of his attitudes and their possible evolution, sources, and motivations, I have found Augustine a powerfully intelligent thinker endowed with both the equipment and the methodology to confront and analyze the ideology, philosophy and theology of his time -- and to find them wanting. Whether in his direct critiques of Emperor, Empire, classical philosophy, history, religion, and education or, indirectly, in allusions in epistles, sermons, remarks,

XUM

his attitudes have constituted an indictment of classical civilization, of Romanitas, in its Graeco-Roman form in his milieu.

Given his milieu, plunged in controversy, tension, theological questioning, reflection, and deeply painful experiences, Augustine slowly and logically developed a theology firmly imbedded in experience. From his reflection upon that experience came his theology of man, creation, sin, grace, redemption, Trinity, and Church. All of these were fashioned and lived out in the saeculum, in the temporal societies of his time: Empire and Church. And within his own Church battles raged over which concept of the People of God as community would perdure. Largely through the theology of Augustine, his ecclesiology triumphed in Western Christendom. Misunderstand him men did as they misused his concept of the two cities to construct what he never intended: a theory of the state and doctrines both of separation, and fusion of the two societies.

Yet, most importantly, his insistence upon the psychological principle of the primacy of the will and the attraction of men's loves as the motivating power in human action gave rise to establishing the principle of social order in the human will and not in the divinity of the state. Dawson sees Augustine's otherworldliness having healthy worldly repercussions in an order based upon the free personality and a common effort towards moral ends. . .Western ideals of freedom and progress owe more than we realize to the thought of the great

African who was himself indifferent to secular progress and to the transitory fortunes of the earthly state.[42]

Finally, in noting the process by which Augustine built a theology by reflecting upon his experience within the framework of his moral dynamic, I see the drama of the individual within any society, any institution: the age-old conflict of the charismatic man and the formative matrix of the institution. Augustine, given his double role in society, functioned in two institutions: Church and Empire. He had to discern how to appropriate the biblical experience he had studied as intensely to the experience of his daily pastoral need.

The place where history is being made through man's encounter with God is the place where conscience is formed, where the Christian witnesses to the tradition: church and world. The way in which the early Christians regarded themselves (sic: Augustine) was a dynamic principle: it strongly affected their way of living, acting, writing. They saw themselves as the answer of disciples to that which God during the earthly life of Jesus had done in and through Him. They were a community wherein they met God. Each generation of Christians sought to understand more fully God's revelation. And when the community's interpretation was rejected at some level, it was by a person developed in community using ideas from other life-roles or other thought-systems. "The philosophical, ethical, or religious genius who makes a genuine breakthrough moves from inherited community ideas to provide a new and deeper understanding

XUM

of community."[43]

Augustine was that kind of man. His overlapping roles: cultural, ecclesial, political, spiritual, led him to view with new vision the community of "Church" in his time. In conspectu aeternitatis, he described it in a new way. For, he saw that men, ever drawn on by love, would often fail in love, and so, in their duty to build community. Therefore, their complete unity, implying their complete unity with the Father, must lie beyond history; it had to be eschatological.

The genius reflects upon the traditum of the community, sees new dimensions or interpretations -- or he can reject the traditum or a part of it. Augustine here exemplifies the very story he saw and described for us: man's freedom, his grace-aided choices, his power to break through into new insights, to listen to a different drummer, to free himself to a remarkable degree from the nurturing moral dynamic of his background -- and in so doing, to disclose a new vision, to lead his people into a new experience of what it means to be a Christian. Augustine had looked so deeply into his own heart that he could tell other men that the law of love in the Gospel was a liberating power; that the human person in disorder from the Fall was still free. Man now had to put his loves in order, for virtue was "rightly-ordered love" (CD XV.22): valuing things in the correct order of priority, according to their true worth. Order was the key principle in Augustine's reflections on the morality of men and societies.

XUM

It was the expression of rationality, for behind all order was its author: God, so, all things in his creation were to be used in order that they might reveal themselves as dependent upon Him.

By the time he wrote the De civitate Dei, Augustine had become so impressed by the power of sin in human life and of man's need for God's grace that human society came to be seen in its horizontal, historical relationships within God's plan, and less in what could be called a vertical relationship to the world. Augustine's theology of the Fall and of redemption through grace led him to see the Empire as a check on disordered men and their disordered loves: God's punishment for sin. It followed logically that the Empire would have to be rejected as part of the divine plan for an instrument of salvation.

Augustine, then, not only rejected the view that had become traditional in two worlds of his time. He also discarded as invalid the imperial theology of Eusebius and his followers. Only the city of God, he felt, was God's saving agent on earth. And he thus undermined the century-old bond between Church and Empire and contradicted the commonly-held thought of both societies.

Yet, in spite of such a lofty concept as that of the true nature of the two cities, Augustine was not exempt from membership in both. He, himself exhibited some of the evil he abhorred: the flawed character inherent in man's acts.

Caught in the saeculum, his own description of the locus of salvation: the corpus permixtum wherein man must work out his salvation, he, Augustine, through a combination of external events and inward motivations, was caught in just what he decried: giving his consent (the just judge!) to what he once would have rejected: religious coercion and intolerance.

His response to that experience was to apply his theology, to appeal to his ultimate criterion of judgment upon any man's actions: the heart right with God, his loves in order. Only God knew the heart of a man -- even when the man hardly knew it himself. And God's grace, he trusted, would save him from the disordered loves of his heart. That hope allowed him to view the ideology of Romanitas with superb detachment (and human trembling), this wonderfully complex, profoundly human, deeply paradoxical man. And so, he found it, like the saeculum in which it was immersed, useless, but useful; out-dated, but timely; as the locus of salvation, and hell on earth. In conspectu aeternitatis, it faded into irrelevance. In the light of the saeculum it was one of many possible mystiques and theories of the good life. He preferred to let his love build a more lasting city, his civitas Dei.

Looking back over this exploration of his views, I find myself wholeheartedly in accord with his coda to the De civitate Dei (XXII.30):

XUM

I think I have now, by God's help, discharged my obligation in writing this large work. Let those who think I have said too little (?), or those who think I have said too much, forgive me; and let those who think I have said just enough join me in giving thanks to God.

Amen.

NOTES

1. Christopher Dawson, Dynamics of World History (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1956), pp. 17 and 37.

2. C. N. Cochrane, Christianity and Classical Culture (London: Oxford University Press, 1939), p. 29.

3. Ibid.

4. Werner Jaeger, Early Christianity and Greek Paideia (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1961), p. 137, note 10.

5. Paul, I Thess. 5:3.

6. Dawson, Dynamics, p. 123.

7. Sir Ernest Barker, Political Thought of Plato and Aristotle (Dover Publications: New York, 1959), p. 7.

8. John Ferguson, Moral Values in the Ancient World (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1959), p. 18.

9. Ferguson (Ibid.) notes that, somehow, a stigma remained attached to work (ponos) as dishonorable in the ancient value system. Athenians introduced a quasi-equality; the Spartans, the homoioi, but this simply meant equality for Athenian citizens, never for slaves or foreigners. The Greek could attain concepts of liberté, and égalité, but the moral judgment involved in fraternité was still ahead of them through the development of philosophical speculation and deepening experience of governmental reality. Of course, Greek colonialism encouraged individualism which threatened the communal aspect of the polis. Notable at this period are the sun words entering the language indicative of that very effort to work at cooperative endeavors, but there is no moral judgment on the nature of that desired togetherness until the tragedies pose the question: Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides.

10. Ferguson notes that the four virtues as they appear in the Republic are linked to the class structure of the community Plato devised, and "accord with the political and psychological scheme Plato was here concerned to expound" (p. 29). A special place is given wisdom by Plato as the peculiar virtue of the philosopher-kings: they alone know good and evil and so have true virtue (knowledge). He calls the virtue of all others merely civic or popular (Rep. IV. 427E; 429A; 430D). Man was to find the good in virtuous knowledge practiced in communal contex.

11. Xenophon placed sophrosune in the center of his moral picture (Mem. 1.5.4) and Aristotle found virtue in the relative mean (Nic. Ethics 2.1106b), yet he glorifies sophrosune and uses this ethical teaching in the Politics (1295a). Still, this virtue had its shortcomings when it became a philosophy of compromise like the middle-class philosophy of Plutarch, and, as Ferguson notes, of John Galsworthy and the founders of the American Constitution (p. 40). As a satisfying basis for an ultimate moral philosophy, however, it proved inadequate; such a philosophy cannot abide neutrality; of its very nature it deals in extremes.

12. Cochrane, Class. Culture. passim.

13. Thucydides has Pericles say: "Therefore we are accustomed to blame chance for everything that happens unexpectedly" (Pel. War 1.140.1). Later, as a philosophical concept, Tuche became chance, and Plato sees all things as due to three causes: Nature, Chance, and Art (Laws. X), while Aristotle thinks it is the incalculable in the human sphere.

    Latin poetry viewed the three Moirai, concepts developed in Greek epic and tragedy as the Parcae, and Macrobius (Sat. 1.19.17) says that Necessity and Tuche (Fortuna) are present at each man's birth along with Daimon and Eros, while Horace (Carm. 1.35.17) concluded that Necessity and Fortuna are one.

14. Franz Cumont, Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism (New York: Dover Publications, 1956), p. 181. (The English translation of the author's Les religions orientales dans le paganisme romain, 1911).

15. Benjamin Farrington, "Astrology," Oxford Classical Dictionary, emphasizes the allegiance astrology commanded from the best minds of the time: "Hardly a branch of ancient culture remained unaffected by it. The Stoic philosophers, trained in Greek thought, partially secularized this ancient temple wisdom, but gave it fresh currency. The astronomers Hipparchus and Ptolemy believed in it. It affected medicine profoundly. It found poetical expression in the Astronomica of Manilius and architectural embodiment in the Pantheon. It supplemented the Ius Civile by the concept of Natural Law."

16. Cyril Bailey, "Roman Religion and the Advent of Philosophy," characterizes the genuine religion of the Romans as "pieced together from excavation and inference. . .for an animistic religion knows nothing of art or mythology, so when we see these in Rome we look for Greek influence or that of Etruria." (Cambridge Ancient History, Vol. 8.423).

XUM

17. Chief among the importations or infiltrations Bailey cites those of Greek or Greek-Etruscan forms and those of the Italian towns. From Cumae close by came the cult of Apollo whose temple was erected as a result of the plague of 433 B.C. Augustus later erected his temple on the Palatine. Gradually Greek games, ludi scenici (394 B.C.) and ludi Apollinares (212 B.C.) became part of Roman life, and with the mixture of di indigetes and di novensides within the pomoerium itself, the Roman were actually practicing a Graeco-Roman religion as of the third century B.C. Cf. Bailey, ibid. 415.

18. Franz Cumont, Astrology and Religion among the Greeks and Romans (New York: G. P. Putnam's, 1912), p. 22.

19. As one of the greatest of ancient thinkers, Posidonius may compare with Aristotle in his collecting the riches of Graeco-Roman civilization, re-shaping them, and passing them on, eventually, to the Renaissance as the product of the Hellenistic world: a consolidation of the philosophy of the 2nd century, B.C. leading to the eclecticism of the first, widening the concepts of Epicureanism as well under Philodemus (d. 40 B.C.), possibly through contact with the Stoics whose greater elasticity is seen in, e.g., Panaetius's denial of ekpurosis which Posidonius had accepted.

20. Bailey, "Roman Religion," p. 455ff.

21. It is Porphyry (d. 305 A.D.), Plotinus's student, who provides the turning point for Neoplatonism, going back to the belief in revelations as part of the way of salvation. His commentary on the Chaldaic Oracles set forth divine revelations and a theological system, included a transcendent god, and a second god, a demiurge, plus hierarchies of heavenly divinities, not at all in accord with the mind of Plotinus. Porphyry's successor, Iamblichus (d. 330 A.D.) taught an exegetical method which tried to safeguard the transcendence of the One of Plotinus. After his death, his disciples at the Pergamum school produced religious-political-philosophical thinkers of the stamp of the Emperor Julian, whose story is typical of the conflicting ideological and religious influences of the fourth century.

22. Erwin Goodenough, "Philosophy of Hellenistic Kingship," Yale Classical Studies, I. 51 ff.

23. Martin Charlesworth, "Some Observations on Ruler-Cult, Especially in Rome, Harvard Theological Review, XXVIII, No. 1 (1935), 32.

XUM

24. Cumont, Oriental Religions, p. 22, insists that "neither pontifical law nor augural sciences ever obtained credit outside the Latin world. It is a characteristic fact that the worship of the deified emperors, the only official worship required of everyone by the government as a pledge of loyalty, should have originated of its own accord in Asia; it received its inspiration from the purest monarchic traditions and revived in form and spirit the veneration accorded to the Diadochi by their subjects."

25. Cumont, Oriental Religions, p. 20.

26. Jerome Carcopino, Daily Life in Ancient Rome (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1940), p. 129.

27. Chester Starr, Civilization and the Caesars (N.Y., Cornell U. 1954), p. 265.

28. W. W. Tarn, Hellenistic Civilization (New York: World Publishing Company, 1961), p. 360, first published in 1927, but thoroughly revised for the 1952 edition which this volume contains.

29. Neither the Stoics nor Epicureans conceded immortality. Pliny (and Lucretius) attack it with vigor: "This sweet but credulous fancy ruins nature's chief blessing, death, and doubles the sorrow of one about to die by the thought of sorrow to come hereafter, also, for if to live is sweet, who can find it sweet to have done living? But how much easier and safer for each to trust in himself?" (Nat. Hist. VII.190).

30. Cumont, Oriental Religions, p. 26.

31. Edwin Hatch, The Influence of Greek Ideas on Christianity (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957), p. 140, with revised notes and bibliography by Frederick C. Grant (Hatch's classic Hibbert Lectures of 1888).

32. Starr, Civilization, p. 278 ff.

33. Cumont, Oriental Religions, p. 211.

34. Dawson, Dynamics, p. 131.

35. Ibid., 32.

36. N. Baynes, The Historia Augusta, Its Date & Purpose (Oxford: University Press, 1926); Markus, Saeculum 2.n.4.

37. N. Baynes, "Comment on the Sources for the Third Century A.D.," Cambridge Ancient History, 1939, XII, 710.

38. Arnaldo Momigliano, "Pagan and Christian Historiography in the Fourth Century," as found in Conflict Between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963), p. 87.

39. Ibid., 99. (CD = Civitas Dei, hereafter)

40. Ibid., 94.

41. A.H.M. Jones, The Later Roman Empire, in three volumes (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1964); p. 170 and following, Vol. I, gives a full account of the sources for the house of Theodosius.

42. Starr, Civilization, p. 667.

43. Peter Brown, Religion and Society in the Age of Augustine (London: Faber and Faber, 1972), p. 50. In this collection of his essays and articles Brown reviews Jones' Later Roman Empire; Cf. n. 41 supra, henceforth known as LRE.

44. Harold Mattingly, Appendix note on Coinage in CAH, 1939, XII.717.

45. M. Rostovtzeff, Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire (Oxford, 1926), pp. 332-3.

46. C. Dawson, "St. Augustine and His Age," in St. Augustine, His Age, Life, and Thought, a collection of essays (New York: World Publishing Company, 1961), p. 27.

47. Momigliano, in Conflict: Fourth-Century, p. 7.

48. Eusebius, Vita Constantini 4.54.

49. H. M. Gwatkin, "Constantine and His City," Cambridge Medieval History, 1911, I, 20.

50. Dawson, St. Augustine, p. 33 (Cf. n. 46 supra).

51. Prudentius, in the Contra Symmachum, 582-591; Eusebius, Theophany, 3.1-2; Melito in his Apology.

52. Andrew Alföldi, A Conflict of Ideas in the Late Roman Empire (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952), p. 100 ff., especially cites Victor's Caesares and the Historia Augusta for the superior tone adopted by the aristocrats, even in regard to emperors, e.g. Amm. Marcellinus (29.3.6) calls Valentinian a "rustic."

53. Jones, LRE, II, 796 (Cf. n. 41 supra).

54. Momigliano, Conflict, p. 81.

55. Eunapius, in Vitae Sophistarum. 472, ed. by I. Giangrande, (Rome, 1956).

56. Peter Brown, Religion and Society, p. 63, citing Jones, LRE, I, 207, and II, 1066, feels that the Later Roman Empire, on the other hand, was a period of "an exceptional degree of social mobility which favored the growth of a loyal administrative class in the Eastern Empire, but was halted by the power of the senatorial aristocracy, who, by the middle of the fifth century, enjoyed a monopoly of high office. The amazing spread of Christianity after the conversion of Constantine illustrates this clearly, he claims. . .and coincides with a grouping of the Roman social hierarchy around the Imperial court.

1. Dawson, Dynamics, p. 31 (Originally, "Sociology as a Science," in Science for a New World, ed. by Sir A. Thomson, London, 1934).

2. Brown, Religion and Society, p. 72.

3. Jones, LRE, supra, and Werner Jaeger, Early Christianity and Greek Paideia (London: Oxford University Press, 1969).

4. Dawson, Dynamics, 407 (1955).

5. J. B. Reeves, "St. Augustine and Humanism," in Augustine's Age and Thought (Cf. n. 46 supra), p. 123.

6. Jones, LRE, II, 986 ff.

7. M.L.W. Laistner, Christianity and Pagan Culture in the Later Roman Empire. . .(Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1951), p. 12.

8. Werner Jaeger, Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture (3 vols. New York, 1939-1945); revised German edition: 1955, Berlin.

9. H. I. Marrou, A History of Education in Antiquity (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1956), p. 303, trans. from the French ed. of 1948.

XUM

10. Ibid., 305.

11. Ibid., 325.

12. Alföldi, Conflict of Ideas, p. 123.

13. Jones, LRE, p. 1002.

14. Horace, Carmina 3.6.5.

15. Cumont, Oriental Religions; Cf. n. 14, Chapter I, supra.

16. J. G. Droysen, Briefwechsel, ed. by Rudolf Hubner (Berlin-Leipzig, 1929), I, p. 70.

17. Marrou, History of Education, p. 425.

18. Ibid., 426; Cf. Laistner, 27 ff (n. 7, Chapter II supra).

19. Prov. 29:17; 25:14; Ecclesiasticus 30:12.

20. Apostolic Constitutions, ed. F. X. Funk (Paderborn, 1905), 4.11; Cf. Didache 4.9.

21. Jaeger, Christianity and Paideia, p. 27.

22. Ibid., 11.

23. Jaeger, Christianity & Paideia, p. 18.

24. W. A. Jurgens, Faith of the Early Fathers (Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1970), p. 7.

25. I Clement 62.3 in Early Christian Fathers, ed. by Cyril Richardson (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1953), p. 72.

26. Jaeger, Christianity and Paideia, p. 118.

27. Ibid., 67.

28. Ibid., 85.

29. Loc. cit.

30. Sister D. Diederich, Virgil in the Works of St. Ambrose (Wash. D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1930).

31. De Labriolle, Pierre, The Church in the Christian Roman Empire (London: Burns Oates, 1952), Vol. II, p. 561.

32. Ibid., 570.

33. A note on the date (p. 84) and for translation of the text into English, in Laistner, Christianity & Pagan Culture, p. 85.

34. Pierre Courcelle makes this thesis in Revue de Philologie, Vol. 24, 1950, pp. 29-56; P. Henry, the same for Basil: Les Etats du Texte de Plotin (Paris, 1938), pp. 159 and 160; Cf. Laistner, 131.

35. De Labriolle, Cr. n. 31, Ch. II, supra, p. 589.

36. Gerhart B. Ladner, The Idea of Reform (New York: Harper & Row, 1967), p. 104, originally published in 1959.

37. Ibid., 82.

38. Basil, De Spiritu Sancto, 9.23 (PG 32.109C), and Ladner's note, 80.

39. Contra Celsum VIII.75, GCS, Orig. II, 292 in Ladner, 116.

40. Ladner, Reform, p. 118 ff.

41. Ibid., 125.

42. Ibid., 130.

43. Jaeger, Christianity and Paideia, p. 100.

44. Ladner, Reform, p. 190.

45. Ibid., 105.

46. Jaeger, Christianity & Paideia, p. 141, n. 4.

47. Ibid., 95 and following.

48. Ladner, Reform, p. 99, n. 63.

49. Jaeger, Christianity & Paideia, p. 144, n. 29.

50. Brown, Religion and Society, p. 205.

51. A.H.M. Jones, "Social Background of the Struggle Between Paganism and Christianity," The Conflict, Momigliano, p. 37.

52. Brown, Religion and Society, p. 164.

53. Ibid., 179.

54. Sir Ronald Syme in his perceptive work, The Roman Revolution.

55. Alföldi, Conflict of Ideas, p. 97.

56. Brown, Religion and Society, n. 1 cites P. Courcelle's comments on the fate of Augustine's answers to Volusianus in Revue de l'Histoire des Religions, 146 (1954), pp. 174-193.

57. Ibid., 175, Cf. Prudentius, Contra Symmachum I.552 ff.

58. And elicited from Augustine ultimately the De civitate Dei.

59. Brown, Religion and Society, p. 179; Leo, Epp. VII & VIII.

60. Alföldi, Conflict of Ideas, p. 107.

CHAPTER III

1. A.H.M. Jones, LRE, I. p. 47.

2. W.H.C. Frend, The Donatist Church (Oxford: the Clarendon Press, 1952), p. xvi.

3. Peter Brown, "Christianity and Local Culture in Late Roman Africa," Journal of Roman Studies, LVIII, (1968), 85-95.

4. Loc. cit. Cf. Brown, "Approaches to the Religious Crisis of the Third Century, in Religion and Society, p. 89.

5. Roy J. Deferrari, "St. Augustine and His Place in Latin literature," in Latin in the Modern World, ed. by M.R.P. McGuire, (Washington D.C.: Catholic University Press, 1960), p. 144. On this subject, Cf. W.H.C. Frend, "A note on the Berber background in the life of Augustine," Journal of Theological Studies XLIII (1942), 188.

6. H. I. Marrou, St. Augustine and His Influence Through the Ages (New York: Harper, 1957), p. 12.

7. Frend, Donatist Church, p. 36, notes: "The Carthaginian and Berber foundations on which Rome had built never disappeared completely.

8. In his Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church (Oxford: Blackwell, 1965).

9. Brown, "Local Culture," p. 86.

10. A point questioned by Brown, "Local Culture," (Cf. n. 3 supra, Ch. III). "Leaving aside," he says, "the total lack of epigraphic evidence for the survival of either Punic or Libyan as significant languages in the fourth century, the literary evidence for the role of local feeling, still more of social and political motivation, in the Donatist controversy is exceedingly fragile."

11. Frend puts forth this argument in "Note on Berber Background..." in n. 5, III supra, Bonner emphasizes Christian Courtois's denial of any survival of Punic after the third century in his "Saint Augustin et le probleme de la survivance de Punique," in Revue Africaine, XXIV (1950), 259-82, and finds Frend's position not so far as this: St. Aug. of Hippo (London: SCM Pr., 1963), p. 37, n. 1.

12. H. I. Marrou, St. Augustin et l'augustinisme, p. 11.

13. In Epistolam Ioannis ad Parthos, 2.3; PL 34-35.1991.

14. Pliny, Natural History, 5.1.

15. Frend, D. Church, p. 335.

16. Lactantius, De mortibus persecutorum 4.1.

17. Brown, reviewing Tengstrom's Donatisten und Katholiken: ... in Religion and Society, p. 338.

18. Willis, Geoffrey G., St. Augustine and the Donatist Controversy (London: SPCK, 1950), p. 2; Dawson, Dynamics, p. 298; Frend, Martyrdom & Persecution, p. 410.

19. From "Commentary on the Apocalypse of Beatus" in Monceaux, Histoire Litteraire, Vol. V, p. 288, nn. 2 and 3.

20. Frend, D. Church, p. 336.

21. Optatus, De schismate, i.19.

22. Frend, D. Church, pp. 25 to 75; Jones, LRE, Vol. II, p. 967, however, feels that "there is not anything very significant in the adherence of the Punic and Berber speaking population to the Donatist cause. Any church which included the peasant masses was bound to have a majority of them, and the Donatists took no pride in the fact. Their leaders were Latin speaking, their literature was in Latin, and so are the inscriptions. The Africans, so far as we know, never possessed any national sentiment.

23. Contra Epis. Parmeniani 3.6.29, PL 43.106.
24. Frend, D. Church, p. 68.
25. Gesta Coll. Carth. i.215-16, PL 11.1350.
26. Augustine, CD, 2.4.
27. Tertullian, Apologeticus (18.23).
28. Ibid., 50 (Loeb edition, 226).
29. Epistle 185.3.12.
30. Tertullian, Apologeticus, 23.
31. Enarration. in Psalmos 88.
32. Cyprian, Passio Marculi, i.PL 8.760.
33. Eusebius, Life of Constantine, III.33.
34. Tertullian, De Praescript, 36.
35. Cyprian, Epp. 11.1; 59.10.
36. Cyprian, Ep. 55.17.
37. Ibid., Ep. 58.
38. Ibid., Ep. 67.
39. Ibid., Ep. 63.
40. Monceaux, Hist. Litt., III.5.
41. Eusebius, HE 10.6.
42. Augustine, Ep. 88.2 CSEL 34.408.
43. Augustine, Contra Cresconium 3.56.62; Ad Catholicos Epistola 19.49.
44. Augustine, Ibid., i.i.
45. Augustine, De Gestis cum Emerito 11.
46. Cf. Frend's excellent Introduction, p. xi to xvi.
47. Ibid., D. Church, p. 94.

48. Optatus, iv.5; vi.7; Augustine, Enarr. in Psalm. 54.20.

49. Monceaux, Hist. Litt., Iv. 414-420.

50. Erwam Marec has summarized the results of the excavations at Hippo Regius in his Hippone la royale, antique Hippo Regius (Algiers, 1954); id. Augustinus Magister, Paris, 1954, pp. 1-18. Marrou calls Van der Meer's "Augustine the Bishop" an "excellent book dealing with his life as an ecclesiastic." The French "Augustin Pasteur d'âmes" (Paris, 1956) was a revision of the Dutch original. The English edition was published by Sheed & Ward, New York: 1961.

51. J. R. Palanque, "Metropolitan Sees at the End of the Fourth Century," in The Church in the Christian Roman Empire, Vol. II, p. 627 (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne, 1952), and Monceaux, Hist. Litt., III, p. 87.

52. Brown, Religion and Society, p. 287.

53. A. Harnack, History of Dogma (Dover Books, 1961) Vol. V, p. 25. Christine Mohrmann studies the language of St. Augustine in "S. Augustin écrivain," Recherches augustiniennes, I.1958, esp. p. 65.

54. Monceaux, Hist. Litt., Vol. IV, p. 351.

55. This prohibition of sacrifice was confirmed on August 7, 395; on July 10, 399 the temples in the Eastern Empire were to be "judiciously" demolished. In Africa we have a directive to forbid sacrifice but to retain festivals, quite in keeping with the culture of Augustine's congregation and his need to preach on such subjects; but on November 15, 407 festivals were forbidden. The Sack of Rome occurred in 410; no wonder pagans connected the two events. Cf. Van der Meer, p. 599, n. 49 for a good summary of laws.

56. A.H.M. Jones, LRE, Vol. II, p. 938.

57. Augustine, Ep. 232, 1 and 2, and Ep. 91, 3. Madaura was his old school town; he may well have seen there the now-identified base and the statue to Apuleius, whom he mentions in De civ. Dei, 8.14 -- but as a practicer of the black arts!

58. Jones, LRE, II, p. 958 ff.

59. Brown, Religion and Society, p. 132.

60. Ibid., 141.

61. Eunapius, Vitae, Vol. II; VII.2. (Cf. n. 55, Ch. I, supra)

XUM

1. Frend, D. Church, p. xvi ff. It must be noted that Frend's work continues the exploration of questions raised by both M.I.Rostovtzeff (Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire, 1926) and, of course, of Henri Pirenne (Mohammed and Charlemagne, 1939). Brown pays both men a deserved tribute (Religion and Society, p. 240) citing Pirenne's idea that the unity of the ancient world continued unbroken until the rise of Islam along the southern shore of the Mediterranean forced Charlemagne to turn to the agricultural world of the North. Rostovtzeff, however, saw the denouement of ancient civilization in the demise of the Graeco-Roman cities of the Mediterranean destroyed by the revolt of the peasantry as soldiers in the Roman army taking advantage of the urban upper classes and destroyed the economy.

2. For a modern approach to this subject: A. Piganiol, L'Empire chrétien (Histoire romaine) IV.2. 1947, pp. 411-22.

3. Brown, Religion and Society, pp. 255 ff. gives a good summary of the current English and French scholarship on the Constantinian approach and its consequences on African soil.

4. Yet, Pope Gregory the Great finds churches which he will label as Donatist fiercely resisting Roman authority in Africa at the very end of the sixth century (R.A. Markus, Saeculum... (Cambridge, England, at the University Press, 1970), p. 131.

5. Brown, R & S (n. 3. supra), p. 242.

6. Woodrow Wilson in his essay, "Mere Literature," p. 11. Cf. p. 274: Addendum to this note.

7. Ad Simplicianum de diver, quaest. I.ii.22.

8. De consensu Evangelistarum 2.20.

9. Hugh O'Neill, S.J., "Concept of Value," fascicle reprint.

10. Brown, R & S, p. 263.

11. Loc. cit.

12. Brown, R & S, p. 264.

13. Prosper of Aquitaine, among others, would appeal to the Augustinian corpus against the Pelagians (ad Rufinum, iv.5.PL 51.80).

14. Cf. Peregrinatio ad loca sancta of Aetheria.

15. Conf.6.16.26, and J. Gaudemet, L'Église dans L'Empire romain, pp. 229-252.

16. Van der Meer, Augustine the Bishop; Cf. n. 50, Ch. III, supra.

17. Angelo Paredi, Saint Ambrose, His Life and Times (South Bend: University of Notre Dame Press, 1964), p. 403.

18. Conf. 7.6.

19. Paredi, St. Ambrose, p. 410, for the sources of the Hexameron.

20. Frend, D. Church, p. 214.

21. Ibid., p. 222.

22. Orosius, 7.36.4 CSEL 7.533-4.

23. Contra Petil. ii. 23.53. col. 278; ii.92.209. Cf. Frend, DC, p. 226.

24. Frend, D. Church, p. 226.

25. A. E. Boak, History of Rome to 565 (New York: Macmillan, 1965), p. 474.

26. Ep. 108.6.18; CSEL xxxiv. 632; Ep. 185.4.15, tr. Dods, 1872 in Vol. III of Works of Aurelius Augustine, pp. 491-2.

27. Cf. Gerald Bonner for a full account of the Psalmus, pp. 253-258.

28. Ibid., p. 267, n. 6,7,8 for these decrees.

29. Procopius's amusing story about Honorius's chickens and the Sack of Rome as not nearly so important as their demise is found in De bello Vandalico i.2.

30. Vernon J. Bourke's excellent work, e.g. Augustine's Quest of Wisdom, Milwaukee, 1954.

31. Dawson, Dynamics, p. 112.

32. Ibid., p. 289.

33. Frend, D. Martyrdom & Persecution, pp. 415-417.

34. Dawson, Dynamics, p. 295.

35. Ladner, Idea of Reform, Ch. III, pp. 63 ff treats of the formation of this theology in the Greek East.

36. Cf. De doct. Christ, III.30.42 ff.

37. Dawson, Dynamics, p. 302.

XUM

38. F. Edward Cranz, "The Development of Augustine's Ideas on Society Before the Donatist Controversy," Harvard Theological Review (1954) Vol. 47. 277 ff. This work has been a major source for this section.

39. Ibid., p. 273.

40. Ad Simplicianum, PL XL. 101-148.

41. Expositio Epistolae ad Galatas, PL XXXV. 2105-2148.

42. P. De Labriolle, History and Literature of Christianity, p. 407, cited in Bourke, op. cit. supra, n. 30, Ch. IV.

43. Cf. here Cranz's note (94) on Augustine's view of the importance of the Simplicianum for his own development (Retract. II.27.3). Cranz: p. 282.

44. Ad Simpl. I.2.16. PL XL. 121.

45. Enchiridion, VIII.26. PL XL. 245.

46. Cranz, p. 287.

47. Dawson, Dynamics, p. 310.

48. Markus, Saeculum, p. 195; Cf. n. 4, Ch. IV, supra.

49. Ibid., p. 43.

1. Markus, Saeculum, p. 23. All of Chapter 2, "Tempora Christiana," is enlightening for Augustine's change of mind as to his estimate of his own period as "Christian times."

2. Etienne Gilson, "Introduction," St. Augustine's City of God, (Fathers of the Church; New York: 1950), Vol. 8, p. li; liv. This perceptive analysis by Gilson refuses to see Augustine as political theorist.

3. "Mentitur qui te totum legisse fatetur; Aut quis cuncta tua lector habere potest?. . .Lines supposedly placed by St. Isidore over the shelves containing the Augustinian corpus in the library at Seville.

4. Markus, Saeculum, p. 71.

5. CD XII. 27: "there is nothing so social by nature, so unsocial by its corruption as this race."

6. R. H. Barrow, Introduction to the City of God (London: Faber and Faber, 1950), p. 196.

7. Ibid., p. 193 for an intensive treatment of the term "eternal."

8. Sermo 36; PL 16. 1061B.

9. Irenaeus, Adversus haereses V.24; PG 7.1186-1188.

10. De schism. Don. III.3; CSEL 26. p. 74.

11. Barrow, Introduction, p. 234; Cf. also p. 191 for eternity of the emperor.

12. Sermo 125.5; PL 38.692-93.

13. Brown, Religion and Society, p. 273; part of his article which appeared in Journal of Roman Studies LIV (1964) pp. 107-16 under the title: "St. Augustine's Attitude to Religious Coercion," a particularly perceptive analysis of Augustine's attitudinal development.

14. R. W. and A. J. Carlyle, History of Medieval Political Theory in the West (London: Wm. Blackwood & Sons, 1930) Vol. I, p. 89.

15. Barrow, Introduction, p. 239.

16. A. W. Ziegler, in Augustinus Magister III (Paris, 1954) p. 206.

17. M. Patricia Garvey, St. Augustine, Christian or Neo-Platonist? (Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1939), p. 230.

18. G. L. Keyes, Christian Faith and the Interpretation of History (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1966), p. 106.

19. Dawson, Dynamics, p. 307.

20. L. Febvre, Le probleme de l'incroyance au XVIe siècle. . . (Paris, 1942), p. 157.

21. I am here coining the phrase "moral dynamic" to encapsulate the melange of elements, including the headings of the five chapters, which together formed Augustine's background which was also foreground at the moment when these elements coalesced into moral decision and action.

22. Dawson, Dynamics, p. 308.

23. Ibid., p. 309.

24. Ladner, Reform, p. 267. Cf. the author's complete section (pp. 239 to 283) on the meaning of the De civitate Dei for the history of reform in regard to the idea of the Church. S.J. Grabowski's The Church: An Introduction to the Theology of St. Augustine (St. Louis, London: 1957) is important, also, for his treatment of Augustine's terminology. He insists that Augustine separates sinners from the just and the holy ones in the Church, the mystical Body of Christ, not in a physical sense, but in spiritual and moral one (p. 577); he uses the symbol of two circles to show the division within the Church graphically, encompassing the members of the Church, mystical Body of Christ: 1) the outer large circle embraces all members united by participation in the sacramental, juridical life of the church, saints and sinners, and 2) inner, smaller circle embracing members who have external bonds, yes, but are united by a life of holiness flowing from their living union with Christ.

25. Ibid., p. 274.

26. Markus, Saeculum, p. 179.

27. Gilson, "Introduction," Cf. n. 2, supra, Ch. V.

28. Ladner, Reform, p. 271, n. 129 has an excellent comment on the controversy between Gilson's view and that of Cranz: "De civ. Dei XV.2" p. 224, n. 22, and Marshall, "Studies" 88.

29. G. G. Willis, St. Augustine and the Donatist Controversy (London: SPCK, 1950), p. 174. Willis contends that in Augustine's pursuit of peace in the Donatist controversy, three great doctrines were evolved and expounded by him: his doctrine of the Church, the relationship of Church and State, and that of the ministration of the sacraments.

30. N. H. Baynes, "Political Ideas of Augustine's De civitate Dei," Byzantine Studies and Other Essays (London: Athlone Press, 1936), p. 303.

31. Willis, Donatist Controversy, p. 176.

32. Contra Gaudentium, XXXIII.42.

33. Brown, Religion and Society ("Attitude toward Coercion") sees this evident in Augustine's attitude to coercion and in his thought in general: his acceptance of moral processes deeply polarized: a polarity of external force and inner change, Cf. p. 271, n. 5.

34. Ibid., p. 274; Cf. for this process of disciplina.

XUM

35. Markus, Saeculum, p. 140.

36. Brown, Religion and Society, p. 319: his "Religious Coercion in the Later Roman Empire: The Case of North Africa," History XLVIII (1963). Brown here mentions the need for a study of the problem of the relation of the Church and lay society province by province because of the influence of local factors.

37. Cyprian, De unitate ecclesiae, V.

38. Bonner, Controversies, pp. 230 ff on the auctoritas of the Church.

39. Letter 185 may be considered a sequel to Letter 93, one of several Augustine wrote to defend the action taken against the Donatists by the Empire. (Cf. Epp. 86,87,89,97,100,105ff.)

40. A work of interpretation is C.N. Cochrane's Christianity and Classical Culture (London 1939), pp. 376 ff, an excellent analysis of Augustine's confrontation with classical philosophy. For his thought, Cf. E. Gilson's Introduction à l'étude de saint Augustin, 2nd ed. 1943. E. Portalié's article in the Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique, Vol. I is still useful, while G. Bonner's Augustine of Hippo: Life and Controversies (1963) is excellent for the Donatist controversy, plus R. Markus's Saeculum: History and Society in the Theology of St. Augustine (1970).

41. An interest heightened by our need to see all theology as historically and culturally conditioned, and the corresponding need to work out relevant theologies in an age of major social change: ours and Augustine's.

42. Dawson, Dynamics, p. 318.

43. Enda McDonagh, "The Christian Ethic: A Community Ethic," in the National Catholic Reporter (1967), p. 18.

* * * * * *

ADDENDUM: Chapter IV, Note 6.

A like change: from paganism to Christianity, took place in the fourth century throughout the Roman Empire. To discover the motivation behind such a change, one does not turn to legislation as a primary factor, a factor we found not so significant

in the Roman aristocracy's conversion. Rather, their indigenous culture and their educational background also strongly dictated the attitudes of Late Roman men. For this reason, the prosopographical method yields such riches, for it investigates the intimate relationships of men's lives: family connections, marriage, loves, etc. A further exploration of how men thought and behaved, their cherished beliefs and values, is additional data also, for assessing their attitudes. As a great stateman of our own time put it,

> we do that assessment by discovering what courses of action, and what manner of dealing with one another men adopted. You can neither tell the story nor conceive the law till you know how the men you speak of regarded themselves and one another; and I know of no way of learning this but by reading the stories that they have told themselves. . . I must know what they revered; hear their sneers; must learn in what accents they spoke love within the family; with what grace they obeyed their superiors; how they conceived it politic to live and wise to die; how they esteemed property, and what they deemed privilege; when they kept holiday and why; when they were prone to resist oppression and wherefore. . . I must know these things before I can comprehend their <u>law</u> books. (Woodrow Wilson, "Mere Literature.")

XUM

BIBLIOGRAPHY

In my footnotes, I have regularly used the following abbreviations and abbreviated forms of titles and standard editions (I include the Volume reference in the PL, CSEL, or CC where this was available):

A. Sources

1 - Collections:

PL	J.P.Migne, Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Latina. Paris: 1844-1864.	
CSEL	Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum. Vienna: 1866 ff.	
CC	Corpus Christianorum Series Latina. Turnhout: 1953 ff.	

2 - Individual Works:

Ad Don.	Ad Donatistas post Collationem	CSEL liii
Ad Simp.	Ad Simplicianum de diversis Quaestionibus	PL xl
Brev. Col.	Breviculus Collationis cum Donatistis	CSEL liii
Conf.	Confessionum Libri XIII	deLabriolle
C. Acad.	Contra Academicos	CSEL lxiii
C. Cres.	Contra Cresconium	CSEL lii
C. Ep. Parm	Contra Epistulam Parmeniani	CSEL li
C. Faust.	Contra Faustum Manichaeum	CSEL xxv
C. Gaud.	Contra Gaudentium	CSEL liii
C. l. Pet.	Contra litteras Petiliani	CSEL lii
De Bapt.	De baptismo contra Donatistas	CSEL li
De Cat.	De catechizandis rudibus	PL xl

XUM

CD	De civitate Dei	CC xlvii; xlviii
De Corr.	De correptione et gratia	PL xliv
De div.	De divinatione daemonum	CSEL xli
De doct.	De doctrina Christiana	PL xxxiv
De Gen.	De Genesi ad litteram Libri XII	CSEL xxviii
De Grat.	De gratia Christi	CSEL xlii
De Gr. Lib.	De gratia et libero arbitrio	PL xliv
De L. Arb.	De libero arbitrio	CSEL lxxiv
De M. Ecc.	De moribus ecclesiae catholicae et de moribus Manichaeorum	PL xxxii
De N. Grat.	De natura et gratia	CSEL lx
De P. Mer.	De peccatorum meritis et remissione	CSEL lx
De pr. Sct.	De praedestinatione Sanctorum	PL xliv
De Sp. Lit.	De spiritu et littera	CSEL lx
De Trin.	De Trinitate	PL xlii
De Un. Bapt.	De unice baptismo	CSEL liii
De Ut. Cred.	De utilitate credendi	CSEL xxv
De Ver. Rel.	De vera religione	PL xxxiv
En. in Ps.	Enarrationes in Psalmos	CSEL xxxvi-xxxvii
Ench.	Enchiridion ad Laurentium	PL xl
Epistul., Ep.,Epp.	Epistulae	CSEL xxxiv, xliv, lvii, lviii
Expos. Quar. Pr.	Ex quarundam propositionum ex Ep. ad Romanos	PL xxxv
Ps. c. Don.	Psalmus contra partem Donati	CSEL li
Retrac.	Retractationes	CSEL xxxvi

Serm.	Sermones	PL xxxviii, xxxix; CC, Series Latina xli
Sol.	Soliloquia	PL xxxii CC vi
Tr. in Ioh.	Tractatus in Iohannis Evangelium	PL xxxv

For the De civitate Dei, I have used the edition of Dombart-Kalb (Teubner, 1928-29) the text recently reproduced in the Corpus Christianorum cited supra: Vols. xlvii and xlviii. I have used the Modern Library translation which reproduced that found in the Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, Vol. II (Buffalo: 1886).

For the Confessiones, the text is taken from de Labriolle, 2 vols. (Paris: 1933; 1937), and the English translation from that of William Watts (1631) as found in the Loeb Classical Library edition.

In regard to the Retractationes, the text used in the CC volume cited supra is that of Pius Knöll (1902) newly Englished by Mary Inez Bogan, RSM: St. Augustine, The Retractations, in the series Fathers of the Church, Vol. 60 (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1968).

B. Secondary Works

Alföldi, A., A Conflict of Ideas in the Late Roman Empire. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952.

Arbesmann, Rudolph, "The Idea of Rome in the Sermons of Saint Augustine," Augustiniana. Louvain: Institutum Historicum Augustinianum, 1954.

Bailey, Cyril, "Roman Religion and the Advent of Philosophy," Cambridge Ancient History, Vol. VIII.(1939).

Barker, Sir. E., The Political Thought of Plato and Aristotle. New York: Dover Publications, 1959.

Barrow, R. H., Introduction to St. Augustine, 'The City of God.' London: Faber and Faber, 1950.

Baynes, N. H., Byzantine Studies and Other Essays. London: The Athlone Press, 1955.

_____. Constantine the Great and the Christian Church. London: 1931.

_____. "Comment on the Sources for the Third Century A.D.," Cambridge Ancient History, Vol. XII. (1939).

Boak, Arthur, A History of Rome to A.D. 565. New York and London: Macmillan Company, 5th edition, 1965.

Bourke, Vernon J., St. Augustine's Quest of Wisdom. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company, 1945.

Bonner, G., Saint Augustine of Hippo. London: SCM Press, 1963.

Brown, P.R.L., Augustine of Hippo: a biography. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967.

_____. Religion and Society in the Age of Augustine. London: Faber and Faber, 1972.

Carcopino, J., Daily Life in Ancient Rome. Translated by Henry Rowell. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1940.

Carlyle, R. W. and A. J., A History of Medieval Political Thought in the West, 6 vols. Edinburgh: Wm. Blackwood & Sons, 1903 to 1936.

Cochrane, Charles N., Christianity and Classical Culture. London, New York: Oxford University Press, 1940.

XUM

Combès, Gustave, La doctrine politique de saint Augustin. Paris: Librairie Plon, 1927.

Cranz, F. Edward, "The Development of Augustine's Ideas on Society Before the Donatist Controversy," Harvard Theological Review XLVII.(1954).

Cumont, Franz, Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism. New York: Dover Publications, 1956.

_____. Astrology and Religion among the Greeks and Romans. New York: G. P. Putnam's, 1912.

Dawson, C., "St. Augustine and His Age," M. C. D'Arcy et al, Saint Augustine. New York: Meridian Books, 1957.

_____. The Dynamics of World History. Edited by John J. Mulloy. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1956.

Deane, Herbert, The Political and Social Ideas of St. Augustine. New York: Columbia University Press, 1963.

Deferrari, Roy J., "St. Augustine and His Place in Latin Literature," Latin in the Modern World; M.R.P. McGuire, editor. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University Press, 1960.

DeLabriolle, Pierre, The Church in the Christian Roman Empire. London: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 1952. Vol. II.

Diederich, D., Virgil in the Works of St. Ambrose. Ph.D. dissertation. Washington, D.C.: 1930.

Droysen, J. G., Briefwechsel. Rudolf Hubner, editor. Berlin-Leipzig, 1929.

Dudden, F. Holmes, The Life and Times of St. Ambrose, 2 vols. Oxford: The University Press, 1935.

Febvre, Lucien, Le problème de l'incroyance au XVIe siècle. Paris: 1942.

Ferguson, John, Moral Values in the Ancient World. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1959.

Figgis, John Neville, The Political Aspects of St. Augustine's 'City of God.' London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1921.

Frend, W.H.C., The Donatist Church. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952.

_____. Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965.

XUM

Garvey, M. Patricia, St. Augustine, Christian or Neo-Platonist? Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1939.

Gavin, Frank, Seven Centuries of the Problem of Church and State. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1938.

Gilson, Etienne, "Foreword," Saint Augustine, The City of God, Bks. I-VIII. (Fathers of the Church, Vol. 8) New York: 1950.

Goodenough, Erwin, "Philosophy of Hellenistic Kingship," Yale Classical Studies. New Haven: Yale University Press, Vol. I.

Grabowski, Stanislaus, The Church: An Introduction to the Theology of St. Augustine. St. Louis: B. Herder, 1957.

Greenslade, S., Church and State from Constantine to Theodosius. London: SCM Press, 1954.

Hatch, Edwin, The Influence of Greek Ideas on Christianity. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957 (Hibbert Lectures of 1888.

Gwatkin, H. M., "Constantine and His City," Cambridge Medieval History, Vol. I. (1911).

Harnack, A., History of Dogma. New York: Dover Publications, Vol. V. (1961).

Jaeger, Werner, Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture. 3 vols. Berlin: 1954-1955.

_____. Early Christianity and Greek Paideia. London: Oxford University Press, 1969.

Jones, A.H.M., The Later Roman Empire, 284-602. A Social and Economic and Administrative Survey. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1964. 3 vols.

Jurgens, W. A., Faith of the Early Fathers. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1970.

Keyes, G. L., Christian Faith and the Interpretation of History. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1966.

Küng, Hans, The Church. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1967.

Ladner, Gerhardt, The Idea of Reform: Its Impact on Christian Thought and Action in the Age of the Fathers. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959.

XUM

_____. "Religious Renewal and Ethnic-Social Pressure as Forms of Life in Christian History." Unpublished paper, Toronto, 1967.

Laistner, M. L., Christianity and Pagan Culture in the Later Roman Empire. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1951.

Markus, R. A., Saeculum: History and Society in the Theology of St. Augustine. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1970.

Marrou, H. I., St. Augustin et la fin de la culture antique. Paris: Editions E. De Boccard, 1st edition: 1938; Retractatio: 1949.

_____. St. Augustine and His Influence Through the Ages. New York: Harper, 1957.

_____. History of Education in Antiquity. Translated by George Lamb. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1956.

_____. The Resurrection and St. Augustine's Theology of Human Values. Villanova: Villanova Press, 1966.

Mohrmann, Christine, "S. Augustin écrivain," Recherches augustiniennes, Vol. I. 1958.

Momigliano, A., "Pagan and Christian Historiography in the Fourth Century A.D.," The Conflict Between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1963.

Monceaux, P., Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne, Vols. V-VII. Paris: 1920-1923.

O'Meara, John, Charter of Christendom: The Significance of the 'City of God.' New York: The Macmillan Company, 1961.

Palanque, J. R., "Catholicism as a State Religion," The Church in the Christian Roman Empire, Vol. II. London: Burns, Oates, and Washbourne, 1952.

Paredi, A., St. Ambrose: His Life and Times. Notre Dame: The University Press, 1964.

Parker, T. M., Christianity and the State in the Light of History. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1955.

Portalié, E., A Guide to the Thought of St. Augustine. Translated by Ralph Bastian. Chicago: H. Regnery Company, 1960.

Piganiol, A., L'Empire chrétien (Histoire romaine, Vol. IV) Paris: 1946.

Pirenne, Henri, Mohammed and Charlemagne. New York: 1939.

Reeves, J. B., "St. Augustine and Humanism," in M. C. D'Arcy et al, Saint Augustine. New York: Meridian Books, 1957.

Rostovtzeff, M., Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire. Oxford: University Press, 1926.

Starr, Chester, Civilization and the Caesars. New York: Cornell University Press, 1954.

Syme, Sir Ronald, The Roman Revolution. Oxford: University Press, 1939.

Setton, Kenneth, Christian Attitudes Towards the Emperor. New York: Columbia University Press, 1941.

Tarn, W. W., Hellenistic Civilization. New York: World Publishing Company, 1961.

Van Der Meer, F., Augustine the Bishop. Translated by B. Battershaw and G. Lamb. London and New York: Sheed and Ward, 1961.

Willis, G. G., St. Augustine and the Donatist Controversy. London: SPCK, 1950.

Ziegler, A. S., "Comment," Augustinus Magister III. Paris: 1954.